



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

AH 54HB L

Harvard Depository  
Brittle Book

332

יהוה

INSTITUTIO THEOLOGICA

ANNO VIII. PVBLICATA MDCCCVII.

ΑΚΡΟΠΟΛΙΣ

ΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ







THE  
PULPIT COMMENTARY,

EDITED BY THE  
REV. CANON H. D. M. SPENCE, M.A.,  
VICAR AND RURAL DEAN OF ST. PANCRAS, AND EXAMINING CHAPLAIN TO THE LORD  
BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL;

AND BY THE  
REV. JOSEPH S. EXELL,  
EDITOR OF 'THE HOMILETIC QUARTERLY.'

WITH  
INTRODUCTIONS  
BY THE  
REV. CANON F. W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S.  
RIGHT REV. H. COTTERILL, D.D., F.R.S.E.  
VERY REV. PRINCIPAL J. TULLOCH, D.D.  
REV. CANON G. RAWLINSON, M.A.  
REV. A. PLUMMER, M.A.

---

London:  
KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH & CO., 1, PATERNOSTER SQUARE.  
1882.

332

PRINTED BY WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS, LIMITED,  
LONDON AND BECCLES.



32, 254

*(The rights of translation and of reproduction are reserved.)*

THE  
PULPIT COMMENTARY,

EDITED BY THE

REV. CANON H. D. M. SPENCE, M.A.,

VICAR AND RURAL DEAN OF ST. PANCRAS, AND EXAMINING CHAPLAIN TO THE LORD  
BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL;

AND BY THE

REV. JOSEPH S. EXELL,

EDITOR OF 'THE HOMILETIC QUARTERLY.'

---

LEVITICUS.

Introductions.

REV. R. COLLINS, M.A.

REV. PROF. A. CAVE, B.A.

Exposition and Homiletics.

REV. F. MEYRICK, M.A.,

RECTOR OF BICKLING, PREBENDARY OF LINCOLN, AND EXAMINING CHAPLAIN TO THE  
LORD BISHOP OF LINCOLN.

Homilies by Various Authors.

REV. PROF. R. A. REDFORD, LL.B., M.A.      REV. R. M. EDGAR, M.A.  
REV. W. CLARKSON, B.A.      REV. J. A. MACDONALD.  
REV. S. R. ALDRIDGE, B.A., LL.B.

London:

KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH & CO., 1, PATERNOSTER SQUARE.

1882.



# AN ESSAY ON SACRIFICE.

BY THE

REV. RICHARD COLLINS, M.A.

WHAT is the origin, true character, and proper place of sacrifice as a part of religion ? Half a century ago, when many of us were schoolboys, there was certain definite teaching on this subject. Probably nine hundred and ninety-nine out of every thousand educated Englishmen, who had seriously turned their thoughts to the matter, were perfectly satisfied with the view, and regarded it as almost axiomatic, that sacrifice was a divinely appointed religious rite, intended to typify and educate the world for one Great Sacrifice, which Great Sacrifice having been accomplished, there was no need for, or even place for, any future sacrifice, truly so called, in the Christian Church. I do not put the matter thus under the idea that the consensus of antiquity is necessarily any warrant for the truth of a doctrine, but only because the view of sacrifice that I have alluded to has seemed to multitudes so scriptural, so simple, so fully to account for the peculiarities and mysteries of the subject, that in reconsidering it we should be led to use the utmost diligence in finally satisfying our minds as to its true place and character.

For we must reconsider it, if not for our own satisfaction, at least for the satisfaction of those we may have to teach. This duty is forced upon us by the fact that the waves of modern opinion have rudely shaken our ancient, and what perhaps we considered our orthodox, notions about sacrifices ; and, indeed, it has been not merely a shaking, but a complex shaking—one wave rolling the notion in one direction and another in an opposite one, so that we feel that we must first secure the notion before we can assign it its true place in history and in reference to the Christian religion.

Men, probably equals in intellectual force and learning, have lately propounded views as to the nature and office of sacrifice so diametrically contradictory the one to the other that both cannot be true : the truth must either reside in the one, to the total exclusion of the other, or it must be found between the two, or beyond either. According to one view, sacrifice is a mistake of man's still undeveloped reason in the days of his ignorant wonder. The inexorable laws of nature pressed upon man's infant intelligence, so that he worshipped them in fear, and exalted them into gods. The inevitable begat the idea of an inflexible, exacting justice which must be satisfied or appeased. Hence arose the idea of propitiation before the presence of this rigorous justice, at length personified, by the immolation of the best a man had—the fruit of his body, or some other costly human sacrifice ; a sacrifice which was, as human reason became more highly developed, commuted by the offering of animal instead of human life. A further development, as human reason grew, was a mere self-sacrifice, not of blood, but of service, as in the case of the Buddhist. And the last stage of development, according to this teaching, is the elimination from mankind of every sacrificial altar and every dogma having a sacrificial aspect.

According to the other view, not only were animal sacrifices of Divine institution,  
LEVITICUS.

prospective to the Great Sacrifice, but the duty of offering a sacrifice is still the central duty of the Christian Church. The Catholic Church is truly Christ's body only so long as it contains a sacrificing priesthood, and a sacrifice as truly such as were the sacrifices of Aaron. The offering of the Holy Eucharist is not a commemorative sacrifice in the sense of its being a commemoration of a sacrifice, but in the sense of its being a true oblation of that which shall plead for the quick, and even, as some hold, for the dead. In short, according to this school of thought, the highest development of human reason in respect to this matter is the exact converse of that previously stated. It is that the life of the Church absolutely depends upon its enshrinement of a true sacrificial altar and upon a continually sacrificing priesthood.

Where lies the truth?

As an exponent of the former view, we may take a recent article in the *Nineteenth Century*, on Shylock's bond, 'The Pound of Flesh,' by Mr. Moncure D. Conway. According to the argument pursued in that article, it is maintained that the idea of sacrifice arose from "non-human nature;" that it was the outgrowth of "nature-worship," the remorselessness of hard "natural" law calling for recompense; and that forgiveness is the highest development of "human nature"—that mercy is the basis of "purely human religion."

As an exponent of the other extreme, we may take the writings of Mr. Orby Shipley, who states that Christ becomes "incarnate in the hands of the priest" at the consecration of the elements in the Holy Eucharist, and that there and then a sacrifice is offered for the sins of mankind.

I propose to consider the subject of sacrifice—

- I. In its origin;
- II. In its limits.

## I.

The doctrine that sacrifices were originally the offspring of human ignorance reflected on the Deity, is fairly summed up in the following extract from Mr. Conway's article to which I have alluded:<sup>1</sup> "Side by side," Mr. Conway writes, "in all ages and races, have struggled with each other the principle of retaliation and that of forgiveness. In religion the vindictive principle has euphemistic names; it is called law and justice. The other principle, that of remission, has had to exist by sufferance, and in nearly all religions has been recognized only in subordinate alliance with its antagonist. An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, blood for blood, is primitive law. Projected into heaven, magnified into the Divine majesty, it becomes the principle that a Deity cannot be just, and yet a Justifier of offenders. 'Without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sins.' Since finite man is naturally assumed to be incapable of directly satisfying an infinite law, all religions, based on the idea of a Divine Lawgiver, are employed in devising schemes by which commutations may be secured and vicarious satisfactions of Divine law obtained. No Deity inferred from the always relentless forces of nature has ever been supposed able to forgive the smallest sin until it was exactly atoned for. For this reason, the Divine mercifulness has generally become a separate personification. The story of the 'pound of flesh' is one of the earliest fables concerning these conflicting principles."

Thus, then, if I understand this line of reasoning clearly, we are brought to the theory that all religions have been the imputations of human feelings and experiences to the Deity. And whether the Deity exist as the Great Unknown or be merely a

<sup>1</sup> *Nineteenth Century*, May, 1880, p. 890.

figment of man's brain, Mr. Conway's argument remains the same. According to this theory, as the principle of retaliation and that of forgiveness have struggled for ascendancy in man's moral development, so in parallel lines have the god or gods, real or imaginary, been vindictive or forgiving. In this way, the history of the religions of mankind is merely the history of man's moral growth reflected on another sphere—where we see the survival of the moral fittest, human mercy, as a purely human force, gradually supplanting human vindictiveness. And thus Divine law, or justice, is translated by human vindictiveness; and the offering of sacrifices, animal or other, is a human scheme by which "commutations may be secured and vicarious satisfactions obtained" to propitiate, or appease, the supposed Divine vindictiveness.

Mr. Conway illustrates and supports his theory by reference to Brahmanic, Buddhistic, and Semitic examples.

"The following legend," he writes, "was related to me by a Hindu, as one he had been told in his childhood. The chief of the Indian triad, Indra, pursued the god Agni. Agni changed himself to a dove in order to escape; but Indra changed himself to a hawk, to continue the pursuit. The dove took refuge with Vishnu, second person of the triad, the Hindu saviour. Indra, flying up, demanded the dove; Vishnu, concealing it in his bosom, refused to give up the dove. Indra then took an oath that, if the dove were not surrendered, he would tear from Vishnu's breast an amount of flesh equal to the body of the dove. Vishnu still refused to surrender the bird, but bared his breast. The divine hawk tore from it the exact quantity, and the drops of blood—the blood of a saviour—as they fell to the ground, wrote the scriptures of the Vedas.

"We may see," Mr. Conway goes on to remark, "in the fable reflection of a sacrificial age; an age in which the will and word of a god became inexorable fate, but also the dawning conception of a divineness in the mitigation of the law, which ultimately adds saving deities to those which cannot be appeased." Versions of this story are traced in some of the Hindu writings; and advancing to the discussion of Buddhism, Mr. Conway says, "With Buddha the principle of remission supersedes that of sacrifice. His argument against the Brahmanic sacrifice of life was strong. When they pointed to these predatory laws of nature in proof of their faith that the gods approved the infliction of pain and death, he asked them why they did not sacrifice their own children; why they did not offer to the gods the most valuable lives. The fact was that they were outgrowing direct human sacrifices—preserving self-mortifications—and animals were slain in commutation of costlier offerings." The Semitic story adduced is, of course, that of Abraham and Isaac. "In the case of Abraham and Isaac," Mr. Conway writes, "the demand is not remitted, but commuted. The ram is accepted instead of Isaac. But even so much concession could hardly be recognized by the Hebrew priesthood as an allowable variation from a direct demand of Jahve, and so the command is said to have been given by Elohim, its modification by Jahve. The cautious transformation is somewhat in the spirit of the disguises of the Aryan deities, who may partially revoke as gods the orders they gave as hawks. It would indicate a more advanced idea if we found Jahve remitting a claim of his own instead of one made by Elohim."

Thus too the Jewish religion and the Christian religion are brought under the same category with Hinduism and Buddhism, and are made to illustrate the same human principles. The idea, possibility, probability, or claims of revelation are untouched.

I do not enter the arena of controversy to discuss with Mr. Conway the character and revelation of Jehovah; that would be quite beside the mark in this commentary. But standing on the platform of Holy Scripture, I wish thence to consider some portions of his theory.

Now, while Jew and Christian have sufficient reason for believing that certain

sacrifices were commanded or sanctioned by Divine revelation, as a part of the religious observances of the Jewish people; yet we find sacrifices of one kind or another common to almost all ancient nations, and practised long before the Israelites were under Mount Sinai. Leaving out of sight, for the present, the object of the Mosaic sacrifices, and the possible question whether Jehovah sanctioned and regulated for the Jewish worship something which was already a part, as it were, of human nature, let us test the question, whether the practice of offering sacrifice can have had any such origin as that suggested by Mr. Conway.

First, take the central idea, if I understand Mr. Conway aright, that the principle of forgiveness, mercy, is a purely human attribute, and that it has been winning its way against the principle of vindictiveness by a kind of natural selection, in the struggle of the noble against the ignoble in the moral world. I fail to read this fact in the history either of the race or of the individual. The principle of retaliation, vindictiveness, we find to-day as robust as when the earliest pages of history were penned. Purely human, it has its origin in the instinct of self-preservation, and seems to be an echo in man of what can be traced through the brute creation. But is mercy, as expressed by the forgiveness of the injurious by the injured, of human origin at all? Is it anywhere to be traced in man's history apart from the influence of the religion of Jehovah? That there is a germ of mercy in the human constitution, there is no doubt; otherwise we could not understand, appreciate, or practise the principle of forgiveness at all. But where in the history of the human race do we find the principle contained in the words, "Forgive your enemies," asserting itself, except in what Christians hold to be a Divine revelation? It is undoubtedly true that Koong-foo-tse taught that men should "do as they would be done by." But we do not know whence he received his philosophy; possibly, in common with Gautama Buddha, from the teaching of pious Jews at the court of Babylon—an influence which may well have had a worldwide character (see Dan. vi. 25—28). And "Do as you would be done by" comes very far short of "Love your enemies." Buddhism, again, contains no teaching, so far as I have been able to discover, on the subject of forgiveness. The nearest approach to it that I have met with, is a story of the queen Sāmavati, who, when her enraged husband was about to shoot her with a poisoned arrow, looked at him with a smile of affection, and so paralyzed his arm that he could not draw the bow; an act that was followed by this wise piece of advice, "When you desire to pacify anger, look upon the angered person with love." But this could only be in the case, like her own, when love pre-existed. And this story is not related by the Buddhists to enforce forgiveness for its own sake, but to illustrate their doctrine that there is a supernatural power, derived from merit in a former state of existence, which preserves its possessor from danger. Mr. Conway states that "in Buddhism the principle of remission supersedes that of sacrifice." I do not know upon what quotations from Buddhistic writings he would verify this statement. Certainly sacrifice is impossible in Buddhism, since it forbids the taking of all life. But I have no evidence that that peculiar law of Buddha has any especial reference to the sacrifice of animals as a religious observance. And with respect to the principle of remission, or forgiveness, I am not aware of a word—though it may be that I have not exhausted the Buddhistic lore—in the teachings of Buddha relating to it, either as a duty of man towards man, or as something to be desired from a higher power. Indeed, Buddhism acknowledges no higher power than man, and seeks not forgiveness, but merit, by which the individual man may be freed from the curse of mortality. That the idea of merit, that underlies all Buddhistic teaching, may originally have been connected with the idea of the remission of sins, is not only possible but probable. But in our present

## AN ESSAY ON SACRIFICE.

---

ignorance of the true historical origin of the teachings of Buddha, this is a subject, the discussion of which would be without the scope of this essay. The fact with regard to Buddhism as now known is that, while the idea of sacrifice is historically present, it has no reference to remission or forgiveness. Self-sacrifice, which is so essential a part of Buddhism, is nowhere connected with remission, but merit; as when Gautama, while a Bôdhisat (i.e. a candidate for the Buddhahood), voluntarily allowed a hungry tigress to devour him, in order to save her life and that of her cubs, as a step towards becoming a Buddha.

In Hinduism, again, there is no teaching on the subject of forgiveness, either as between man and man, or the deity and man, except in a very few passages in some of the earliest hymns of the Rig Veda: as Hinduism progresses, the idea is lost, not developed. When the head of the cock is cut off before the altar of Kâli, there is no thought of obtaining forgiveness of the deity; the general idea is, as with the Buddhist, that merit will accrue on the performance of a prescribed act of religion which they have learned from their forefathers. There are whole races of men in whose vocabulary there is no word for forgiveness. The spirit of retaliation seems to be still as potent as ever, apart from the spirit of Christianity. The successful struggle of the principle of forgiveness, as a purely human attribute, against the principle of retaliation, does not appear to me to be made out. There must, therefore, be some other reason why the virtue of forgiveness, theoretically at all events, holds so influential a position in the ethics of the learned men of Europe. The Christian would maintain that this virtue has been learned solely from Holy Scripture by the moderns, and from anterior Divine revelation by the ancients.

Then, again, we have to confront the theory that man, under the influence of a religious instinct (and, of course, the case of the Christian religion is here included), has formed no higher ideal of Divine justice than such as is a reflection of his own innate sense of retaliation or vindictiveness. This, I suppose, to be the meaning of the passages quoted before: "In religion the vindictive principle has euphemistic names; it is called law and justice. . . . An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, blood for blood, is primitive law. Projected into heaven, magnified into the Divine majesty, it becomes the principle that a Deity cannot be just, and yet a Justifier of offenders."

Now, this is a subject that requires extremely nice discrimination. For that the idea of vindictiveness, or retaliation, has been "projected," so to speak, on the Divine justice by the short-sightedness of man, there is no doubt. But that the idea of the Divine justice that underlies the Christian religion is the offspring of such a principle in man's heart, is a theory which entirely subverts the truth of Christianity.

We may begin by remarking that our natural views of justice, equity, are not, of course, in any degree the children of our natural impulse towards retaliation. Nor can Mr. Conway be supposed to suggest this. Equity, human justice, represented by the ancients under the symbol of an even balance, so far from being the child of the principle, or spirit, of vindictiveness, is that which alone controls it. Justice determines whether the "pound of flesh" and the debt are really in equipoise; justice stops a man when his instinctive vindictiveness sends him in pursuit of his enemy; the laws of England do not allow a man to retaliate, but endeavour to put him into the hands of justice; and so when our Saviour said, "Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: but I say unto you, That ye resist not evil," he evidently meant that men should curb the impetuosity of personal vindictiveness, and leave their case in the hands of a more perfect justice.

Man has the power of realizing a perfect, even-handed justice, however often and however far he may have abused the principle in practice. And although he may have

reflected his own imperfections on false gods, and may have made them vindictive, the Divine justice that underlies the Christian religion owns none of this imperfection, but is in accordance with that perfect ideal that man is capable of forming, though not always of practising.

How, then, does the Christian religion regard the Divine justice in relation to the forgiveness of sins? Does it impute to that justice vindictiveness, or retaliation, and then "devise a scheme by which a commutation may be secured, and a vicarious satisfaction obtained," to meet the inexorable demands of that Divine retaliation? The Scripture does indeed say that "by the deeds of the Law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight." But this is no threat of retaliation; for it simply states a self-evident fact, that a man cannot be both guilty and guiltless. And there is no part of Holy Scripture which says that "the Deity cannot be just, and yet a Justifier of offenders." On the contrary, it says that "God can be just, and yet the Justifier of the ungodly;" and it makes it a part of the justice of God that he does forgive offences, for "He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins." But it will be said, this act of God's justice, in forgiving offenders, is only extended, according to the Christian Scriptures, in view of the "satisfaction" made to the Divine justice in the death of the Saviour Jesus Christ as a vicarious offering; and that a satisfaction implies something to be satisfied. This is in a certain sense true; but there is no word in the New Testament which represents the satisfaction as made to any principle of retaliation. And I may note, in passing, that the word itself, "satisfaction," though occurring in the Prayer of Consecration in the English Prayer-book, does not anywhere occur in that connection in the New Testament. The utmost care is needed in enforcing the doctrine of the atonement from the pulpit, lest the idea of retaliation should be inferred. The spirit of retaliation would make God thirst for the blood of the sinner, whereas God "willett not the death of a sinner;" it would represent the Deity as injured, whereas God cannot be injured. We cannot shut up the doctrine of the atonement under the naked formula, that man must be punished on account of his sins unless some one else can be found to be punished for him; that the justice of God must have suffering somewhere, if man is not to suffer. To provide suffering was not the one only object of the atonement; it was not merely to balance suffering against suffering that the one Great Sacrifice was offered.

To what, then, was satisfaction made? It is made to absolute justice, to the truth of God; and it is made not only by the sufferings, but by the perfect life of Jesus, as the perfect man, in obedience to the Law. Justice—not retaliation—demands that what a man sows, that shall he reap. Man sows sin, and reaps the necessary results—death, the forfeiture of God's presence. Man cannot be pardoned and restored on his own merits. The merits of another are offered to him. The picture of atonement in the Old Testament is that of a covering of sins, and in the New Testament is reconciliation of man to God. In the English version of the New Testament the word "atonement" occurs once, and translates the word which is elsewhere translated "reconciliation" (*katallassis*). The satisfaction on which this covering of sins and reconciliation of man to God is based embraces the life, death, resurrection, ascension, and mediation of the Saviour God-man. The object in view of the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus was not one, but manifold. It was to manifest God ("God manifest in the flesh"); to reconcile man's heart ("You, that were sometimes alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy and unblameable and unreprovable in his sight"); to show man that he has a Mediator ("the one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus"); to prove his love ("Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends"); to enter death that he might show man that he is the victor over it, as

the Firstfruits from the dead ("If Christ be not raised, then is our hope in vain"); to read a lesson to other spheres ("To the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the Church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord"). In all this he stood in man's place to suffer; the "chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed;" "he redeemed us from the curse of the Law, being made a curse for us." His merits were so perfect that they outweighed all man's demerits, so that for his sake man can be justified and accepted according to the covenant of grace. Nay, this doctrine of the atonement is too wonderful, too mysteriously great, too deep to be gauged by man; we have not yet fathomed its depths; nor had even the inspired apostle, who wrote, "Oh the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!" But to introduce the spirit of vindictiveness, or retaliation, on the part of the Jehovah of the sacred Scriptures, as thirsting for the blood of the sinner, and demanding the sufferings of Christ from any principle analogous to the human principle of retaliation—as though he would demand the pound of flesh because he could not obtain the sheltered dove—is one of the greatest insults ever offered to the Christian religion, which declares that the whole motive power towards salvation was love. "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life."

The fact, however, remains, that the Christian religion does centre round a Sacrifice; and the further fact remains, that not only was the Jewish religion a religion of sacrifices, but that in almost all, if not all, nations sacrifices have been offered from the earliest days of historical man, and in many cases up to the present moment. What has originally given birth to the idea of sacrifices? It is asked, "Are they not substitutions, that have suggested themselves to man, by which to propitiate and avert from himself the supposed Divine vindictiveness, which he has euphemized as Divine law and justice?" The answer must be, first, that it seems impossible that man could invent the system of sacrifice. Suppose a man, in the dawn of human reason, who should have no better idea of Divine justice than as interpreted by his own innate vindictiveness. We may even suppose him to have reasoned up to the conclusion, that the deity cannot be just, and yet the justifier of the guilty; that is, that a man cannot be held to be guiltless unless his complete innocence is manifest. And to this he adds, from his own nature, that Nemesis must overtake him. But what is there in human nature to suggest to him to make an offering in blood, whether human or animal? He fears, it may be, the vengeance, the vindictiveness, or even the malignity of an unseen deity on himself. But what is there in that to suggest the idea of a propitiatory offering, a commutation, a vicarious satisfaction, in lieu of his own person, in blood? Nay, what is there to suggest any offering of any kind? Human vindictiveness might lead him to hurl a dart at the imagined deity, could he hope to reach him; but of what avail would any kind of offering be? Would he think of bribing the deity not to injure him, as he might bribe an earthly judge? Should such a thought arise in his mind, it would perish at the first attempt; for what man would try twice to bribe an earthly judge who persistently refused the bribe? And what man, in fear of an earthly judge, would think of going to his door with the life-blood of his son, or of the best of his flock?

We will suppose the case of such a primitive man, totally unacquainted, from whatsoever cause, with any portion of a Divine revelation. He embodies in his imagination the phenomena of the atmosphere as the attributes of a personal deity, whom we may call Indra. From Indra he receives the bounties of the sun and rain which mature his harvests, and also the floods, torrents, tempests, and thunder and lightning, which make

him fear. He surrounds this deity with a moral atmosphere of inflexible, uncompromising remorselessness—the moral shadow, we may say, of the character he attaches to the physical heavens. Suppose, then, that one day, when he and his sons are reaping their harvest, their great desire being for a cloudless heaven to dry their sheaves, an ominous cloud gathers; the heavens are soon black, the forked lightning darts with angry quiver from cloud to cloud, and from cloud to earth; the thunder seems to split the firmament in rage; till out darts a forked tongue of flame, and slays his youngest son at his feet. Will he regard this as Indra's retaliation on account of some offence he has been guilty of? Suppose it is so. What would human nature suggest to him to do in order to escape, if possible, Indra's further vindictiveness? Is there anything in his nature that would lead him to cut the throat of his eldest son, and, hurling him on a pile of faggots, to consume his body with fire, as a holocaust, to appease the supposed wrath of Indra, and so, under the idea of sacrificing a substitute of the greatest worth in his estimation, to ward off danger from himself? Would he be likely to fling the blood of his lamb or his kid towards the heavens, under the idea of sheltering himself from Indra's retaliative stroke? Or could anything in his own nature suggest to him that Indra required some voluntary sacrifice? We cannot touch even the elements of such a thought in man's nature, much less trace their development. There is nothing whatever, surely, in human nature to suggest such thought or action.

But there is a kind of sacrifice which man has always understood—self-sacrifice for the sake of another. Mr. Conway's illustrations would seem to me to touch this thought rather than the idea of commutation by sacrifice. History is full of this phase of sacrifice. When Gautama Buddha, as related above, was pictured as giving his body as food to the tigress, the idea was self-sacrifice for the sake of the starving animal and her young. The bravery of Horatius Cocles, though his life was spared, is an illustration of the same thought. There is the idea of substitution: but it is a substitution in the sacrifice of one's self at one's own hands for the salvation of another. This is a doctrine which man can understand. But the idea of thrusting forward a substitute for the sake of guarding one's self is foreign to man's innate nobility.

Turn the matter as we will, nothing is more difficult than to try to realize what there is in man that would lead him of his own accord to offer the life of a bullock, a sheep, a goat, or a dove, to propitiate the Divine justice. But it has been done in all ages. How has the custom originated?

It has arisen about the world-sacrifice of Jesus Christ. That was a self-sacrifice of the highest conceivable import; but it involved the shedding of a life. And that one Sacrifice, coupled with the life, resurrection, and ascension of Jesus Christ, was in all its bearings the most significant event that ever happened in the history of the human race. Should not, then, the world of all time be educated for that one great central "mystery of godliness," the reconciliation of the world by "God manifest in the flesh," the outward circumstance of which was the life-shedding of Jesus on Calvary?

X The world has often been divinely taught by signs; and the deeper the degradation of man, the simpler and more pointed the sign. Jeremiah, with his "marred girdle," his "potter's clay," his "good and evil figs;" Ezekiel, with his "tile," his "razor," his "staff upon his shoulder," and his "seething-pot," are familiar examples. In these days of the Christian Church we are taught by a very significant symbol to realize, as we look upon it, the offering of Jesus Christ on the cross; a symbol appointed by his own words and acts—"This do in remembrance of me." The breaking of bread and the eating it, the pouring out of wine and the drinking it, are the symbol under which we are to "show the Lord's death till he come."

But how was the world to be educated in prospect of that Sacrifice? The great

central fact to be taught was—the shedding of a life the salvation and life of the world. We are taught now to look upon that Sacrifice at a meal, because the atoning power must always be connected with the life-giving power. The eating of bread and the drinking of wine are signs distinct enough to keep the world in memory of the fact and character of the death of Christ, the Life of the world. The Lord's Supper is, moreover, a bridge of history, taking us back by unerring steps to the hour of its institution, and the hour of Christ's agony. But to prepare the world for this great idea, to perpetuate through succeeding generations, before the event, an expectation of the coming "mystery," something more distinct was appointed.

To take the Mosaic dispensation as a starting-point, we find under that dispensation the great analogue to the Lord's Supper in the system of sacrifice. And we have the authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews for saying that the Jewish sacrifices were a figure of Christ. Then also the symbol was connected with a meal; or had in every case at least some reference to food. Except in the case of the whole burnt offering, either the priests and the offerers of the sacrifice, or the priests alone, solemnly ate the offering, and that for the most part, in "the holy place." Nor was the animal sacrifice the only sacrifice: the "meat offering" (*minchah*) was as truly a sacrifice as the lamb, part being also consumed in the holy fire, and part eaten by the priest. Every animal sacrifice was an animal or bird used for food. But to the ritual of the animal sacrificial meal was added a most elaborate ritual as to the previous slaying of the animal itself, and the sprinkling of its blood, the offerer putting his hand on the head of the victim, and being taught to regard the sacrifice as a picture of atonement, the Hebrew idea of which was a covering, or a hiding of sin; and the blood was called the blood of the covenant. Thus, while the lesson of life by food is the same in the Lord's Supper and the sacrificial feast, the symbol of breaking of bread in token of the death of the Lord's body is replaced by a much more powerful symbol in the slaying of the animal that supplies the feast, and the solemn sprinkling of its blood. The two ordinances are from the same hand; and while we see the exquisite beauty of the symbolism in the commemorative Supper of the Lord, we cannot fail to see the beauty of power in the parallel symbolism of the shedding of blood in the prospective Old Testament dispensation.

But for the Jews to realize that power they must have been instructed in the fact that God would provide a greater, a perfect atonement in the person of the long-promised Messiah. They must have had an intelligent knowledge of what the "covenant" meant. The Eucharistic service of the Church of the Christian dispensation could have no meaning for the man who was unacquainted with the atonement of Christ. Nor can we conceive the intelligent and devout Jew seeing in the mere blood and death of an animal a covering for his sin. The Jew was not taught that the death of the animal was accepted instead of his punishment; but he was instructed to look upon it as a foreshadowing of a perfect Offering to come. This may not be apparent on a cursory glance at the Pentateuch; but the New Testament commentary leaves no doubt on the question. "It is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins;" the first tabernacle was "a figure for the time then present;" "the Law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image" (or full revelation) "of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually make the comers thereunto perfect." This is not a contradiction of the Old Testament, but an explanation of the Mosaic dispensation. Of Moses we know, through our Saviour's own words, that he saw through and beyond the type to the Antitype: "Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me: for he wrote of me;" as of Abraham, that he "saw Christ's day, and was glad." That the sacrifices

were nothing in themselves is a lesson constantly brought before the Jews. "To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me?" saith the Lord: I am full of the burnt offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beasts; and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he goats." That the offering of the sacrifice was efficacious in itself for atonement as an *opus operatum*, was man's perversion of the truth; a perversion that is consonant with all that we know of human nature, of which every age testifies that it will hold tenaciously to the outward forms of religion, and with difficulty maintain its spirit. The Jew was never taught that the slaying or offering of the animal was an atonement in itself. Neither the animal nor the *minchah* was a substitute for something else—a commutation, but a foreshadowing, an educating of the world for the appreciation of the one atonement. As the sabbatical divisions of days and years were to familiarize Israel with the idea of a final rest; as the cities of refuge were to familiarize them with the idea of salvation; as the most remarkable institution of the goel, the kinsman-redeemer, was to familiarize them with the idea of redemption;—so the most elaborate ritual of sacrifice was to train them for the expectation of the offering of Jesus Christ once for all on the cross, for the reconciliation of the world. It was the great sacrament of the old world.

Thus, then, the nature and the object of the Mosaic sacrifice seems very evident; and its origin, with that of all its most remarkable accompaniments, was Divine. The further question now arises, What was the origin of other and previous sacrifices? First of all, the idea of sacrifice, as connected with the worship of Jehovah, was not originated under the Mosaic dispensation. Jethro, before the institutions of Mount Sinai, "took a burnt offering (*olah*) and sacrifices (*zebachim*) for God." These are the same words that are in use afterwards under the Mosaic dispensation, "And Aaron came, and all the elders of Israel, to eat bread with Moses' father-in-law before God" (Exod. xviii. 12)—not an ordinary, but, no doubt, the sacrificial feast, the old-world sacrament. Again, Jacob, on the eve of his memorable parting with Laban, "offered sacrifice upon the mount, and called his brethren to eat bread." The sacrifice here, again, was the *zebach*; and was not the "eating bread" the same sacrificial feast? Noah also on coming out of the ark "buildest an altar" (*mizbeach*, from *zabach*, to slay), "and took of every clean beast, and of every clean fowl" (i.e. such as were eaten), "and offered burnt offerings (*olah*) on the altar." Of Abel also, in the very first generation of historical men, we know that he "brought of the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof," as an offering unto the Lord; and why was his offering acceptable but that it was brought in obedience to God's own express direction?

The animals sacrificed were always food animals. Twice the sacrifice is mentioned in connection with a meal. And in Exodus, "to hold a feast" and "to sacrifice" seem to refer to the same event. The inference, therefore, is by no means extravagant, that the pre-Mosaic sacrifices were of precisely the same kind as those of the Mosaic dispensation. The "clean" animals used for sacrifice were so used because they were the animals used for food. (The theory, it may be observed, that animal food was not used before the Deluge seems to rest on no foundation whatever.) And if food was consecrated to the worship of Jehovah from the days of Adam, as food is now consecrated by the words of Jesus himself to the same worship in the Lord's Supper, where shall we seek for the origin of that significant feast, and the ritual of its observance, but in Jehovah himself?

It may not be unimportant, as a confirmation of such a view of the matter, to note here that the Mosaic dispensation, in probably every point, would seem to have been a *renewal* of former Divine directions as to the externals of worship. The leading features of the Mosaic dispensation wear the appearance rather of a reformation than

of an initial institution. Thus the very form and character of the tabernacle itself, and after it of the temple of Solomon, were precisely the same as we now find in many Hindu temples. We cannot think that the Hindus copied at any time the form of the tabernacle in the wilderness or of the temple on Mount Moriah. Rather we must suppose that the Hindus still perpetuate what was the most primitive form of a temple for Divine worship, the fane with its two rooms and the surrounding court; and that that form was reinstated under Mount Sinai. Nor was there anything new in the Aaronic priesthood: Melchizedek was a *cohen*; Jethro was a *cohen*. Then, again, as to the sacrifices, the *minchah* is still the daily offering in the Hindu temple; food is offered before the idol in the inner room of the fane, a handful is consumed on the sacrificial fire, and the meal is eaten by the priests. The same kind of food offering was made both by Greeks and Romans. The sacrifice of food animals has also been perpetuated by various other nations. Such were the principal sacrifices among the Greeks and Romans, and among the Hindus there is still the sacrifice of the lamb. Some even of the minutiae too of the more ancient rites evidently remained intact for ages; as, for instance, compare Numb. xix. 2, "They shall bring thee a red heifer . . . upon which never came yoke," with Ovid ('Fasti,' iii. 375, 376)—

"Tollit humo munus cessa prius ille juventa,  
Quæ dederat nulli colla premenda jugo."

We cannot account for these things by supposing that the heathen nations learned the rules of sacrifice from the Jews. The only rational supposition is that they retained many of the externals of primitive worship, while the worship of the Jews was truly the primitive worship divinely restored. Heathen religious rites and sacrifices are fossils of the old-world Church history, the *exuviae* of dead faiths. Incrusted, indeed, they are with superstitions many and grievous, petrified, the true primitive life long since crushed out of them; but yet unmistakably the remains of an ancient garden of the Lord's, of a primitive sacrificial and sacramental worship, the analogue of that which was again seen in the days of Moses, David, and Solomon.

If such be the case, we cannot hesitate to conclude that the whole system of heathen sacrifice, however degraded and distorted in its present application, bears ample witness to a Divine origin. The theory that sacrifice is an outcome of human nature does not bear examination. The fact that man will cling to the externals of religion while losing its spirit, is attested by all history. The very existence, therefore, of priest and sacrifice as worldwide facts would seem to point back infallibly to a day of pure religion and a God-appointed worship.

## II.

Is there a sacrifice, a priesthood, and an altar in the Christian Church?

This question is so suggestive, and related to so much that is collateral, that only salient points must here be touched upon, and such as have reference to what has gone before, or this essay would very soon exceed its due limits.

First, perhaps, it is well to guard one's self against an idea too commonly expressed, that the Mosaic dispensation was "imperfect." The thought has arisen around the expression in the Epistle to the Hebrews of the "greater and more perfect tabernacle." The Mosaic dispensation was imperfect, as all human things must be, even when of Divine appointment, when compared with Christ; but it was not imperfect as a dispensation. No ordinance from God's hands can be imperfect. The sacrificial system must have been the very best method of teaching the ways of God to man, or it would not have been instituted. We must not, therefore, approach the words, "sacrifice,"

"priest," "altar," with a prejudice. They were once God's ordinance. Are they so still?

The Lord's Supper is manifestly a modification of the ancient prospective sacrificial system, for the edification of the Church in retrospect. In what particulars, as regards directions actually recorded, does the institution given under Mount Sinai differ from the Saviour's institution? In both the Saviour is typified by food at a meal. But in the latter there is no direction as to an "offering;" neither is the Church nor the individual instructed to "present" the bread and the wine before God, as under the former sacrificial system. There is no direction as to animal food; indeed, practically it is prohibited. There is, therefore, no ritual of blood. There is no command to confess sins in connection with an offering, as when under the older dispensation the offerer laid his hand on the head of the victim. There is no command to burn a portion of the food in the sacred fire; no sacred fire is vouchsafed. Hence no altar, of the same character as the Jewish altar, is required; nor is one mentioned by the Saviour. There is no mention made of a priest; those who were commanded to perpetuate the ordinance were not called *cohens* by Christ, but "apostles," missionaries. Nearly all the actual ancient sacrificial duties, both of priest and people, were practically abrogated at the institution of the Lord's Supper, the only point authoritatively preserved being the partaking of the *minchah* with wine. The Lord's Supper, then, in that it is a typical feast, a part of the ancient feast, picturing the blessed Redeemer in his sacrifice for the life of the world—"This is my body, which is given for you;"—"This is my blood of the new covenant"—has most distinctly a sacrificial aspect; but it is denuded of almost all the observances peculiar to the ancient sacrificial feast. It points to the same *offering* as the old-world sacrifices, and by the same method, but accompanied, as it is apparently intended to be, with much less elaborate circumstance. An adaptation, however, of the more ancient sacrificial system it most manifestly is; such an adaptation as seemed to him, who is the All-wise, best fitted for the edification of the future Church.

But is it not evident that, by the method of our Saviour's institution, many details were left to be otherwise determined? Nothing can be more distinct than the matter, the form, and the intention of the Lord's Supper; but there is no direction as to the how, the when, or the where. Under the Mosaic dispensation every, the most minute, particular was provided for by Divine ordinance. Time, place, person, and manner are most exhaustively described. But our Saviour did not in like manner appoint the priest, the vestments, the accompaniments, the ritual of the Holy Meal. The commission, "Do this in remembrance of me," was given to the sacred society of apostles, or missionaries, who afterwards received that further commission, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." They, therefore, were the first celebrants; but their exact method of procedure has not been handed down to us. They were inspired men; had they subsequently any Divine directions? All we know on this matter is found in 1 Cor. xi. Were the apostles left to their private judgments as to the arrangements necessary for the suitable celebration of the Lord's Supper? or were they divinely directed? We cannot know. But we do know that very early in the history of the Church the Lord's Supper was separated from the *agape*, and administered at a special service; that at this service there were customs which seem to be a modified revival of the customs of the ancient sacrificial system, notably the confession of sins by the congregation, and the public declaration of God's acceptance on repentance. It could not have escaped the early Christians, especially the Jewish converts, that the Lord's Supper (established, too, as it had been, during the observance of the most significant and important of the Jewish sacrificial feasts) was a

retrospective adaptation of the once prospective sacrifice. We cannot wonder, therefore—though we know not the exact customs of the apostles themselves—that we should early read of the Christian sacrifice, the Christian priest, the Christian altar. The “elements” of the feast were a continuation of the “meat offering,” the *minchah*, part of every former sacrifice; the presbyter, elder, or president, who served at the table, though not a priest of the Aaronic line, yet might well be called, in a certain though modified sense, a priest; and the table at which he served, though no longer the seat of the sacred fire, or sprinkled with blood, was to the Christian what the altar had been to the Jew—that from which he fed on the picture of Christ. And I cannot doubt, on a candid examination of the expression, though I once held to the contrary, that there is a reference to the table of the Lord’s Supper in Heb. xiii. 10, “We (Christians) have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle.” True it is that Christ’s divinity is the actual altar of the universe, which upheld, sustained, and sanctified the humanity of Jesus in his sacrifice of himself; yet, as the Jewish altar was that which held the picture of the Sacrifice to come, and from which the Jew ate the emblematic feast, so the holy table from which we Christians feed in memory of Christ’s death, is, in a parallel though modified sense, an altar. To refuse to the Christian Church, then, the very names of sacrifice, priest, and altar would seem almost to be to deny the propriety and solemnity of the words under the earlier dispensation, and to interfere materially with our understanding the real significance of our Saviour’s institution as an adaptation of the divinely appointed sacrificial system to the Christian dispensation.

Yet as different views may, no doubt, lawfully be taken as to the intention of our blessed Saviour’s silence at the moment of the institution of the Lord’s Supper, we should surely allow that latitude of thought to others who, like ourselves, love the Lord Jesus in sincerity.

What is the error that has grown up about the words “sacrifice,” “priest,” and “altar”? It is idolatry; that is, making the picture more than a picture. When the Jew believed that the blood of bulls and of goats *could* take away sin, he perverted the truth and the ordinance of God; and when the Christian holds that there is in the Lord’s Supper a propitiatory sacrifice for the quick and the dead for the remission of sins, he equally abuses the truth of God and the beauty of the ordinance. It is the confounding of the inward spiritual grace in the sacraments with the rite itself that has been at the root of the chief of the religious errors of mankind. The inward spiritual grace is the apprehension and appropriation by the intelligence and the affections of that which the outward observance typifies, and therefore to the faithful the actual reception of its benefit; and the observance itself, when rightly understood, becomes an instrument in arousing that apprehension, as well as a pledge and means, by virtue of its institution, of our receiving that grace. But to make a sacrament an *opus operatum*, to convert the image into that which it represents, is idolatry. It is this astounding, though truly human, error that plunged the ancient world into heathenism, the Jewish world into Pharisaism, and the Christian world into what is now commonly called Popery. The fall of the intelligence when the floods of superstition are let in upon the soul, is great indeed; so that a man can even hold the blasphemous doctrine that the blessed Redeemer can become incarnate in the sacramental elements of bread and wine in the hands of the priest, and that it is necessary for salvation that the body, soul, and divinity of Jesus Christ should be digested in the human stomach. This is a fall sorer than any fall on record of the Jews; however much we may pity their unbelief, we have no evidence that any Jew ever taught that every Passover lamb and every victim brought to the altar was God incarnate; and yet, if it be true

of the Christian element of sacrifice, it must have been true of the Jewish. We cannot wonder at the reformers of the English Church expunging the word "altar" from the Prayer-book, when we know how the idea of the Christian altar was perverted to serve the purposes of the grossest idolatry. But in meeting the doctrinal errors that have entwined themselves, like Laocoön's snakes, around the Christian altar, it is surely not necessary for us to blind ourselves to the fact that our Saviour did perpetuate for the Church the principle and method of the ancient sacrificial feast; and that, therefore, in some sense at least, we have, as the Church seems from very early times to have expressed herself, a sacrifice, a priest, and an altar; always remembering that, in reference to sacrifice, that sense, as defined by St. Chrysostom and others in the early Church, who speak of the Eucharist as a sacrifice, is that it is a "*commemoration of a sacrifice*" (*vide* St. Chrysostom on Heb. x. 9).

The points to be kept, then, constantly and prominently before the Church are: first, that we must not misinterpret the character of the Jewish sacrifice itself; second, that we must maintain, as a truth for all time, that an image of a thing cannot be the thing itself; and third, that as the Jewish sacrifice was not truly in itself propitiatory, but only the figure and pledge of propitiation and spiritual life, so there is no propitiation, but only a figure and pledge of the propitiatory and life-giving office of Christ in the Holy Eucharist. And then we need not fear to use the Old Testament terms, as in one instance appears to me to have been done in the Epistle to the Hebrews, for designedly parallel Christian ordinances.

And the conclusion of the whole matter seems to be, that the Church still has, in a reasonable though modified sense, not an offering for sin, but still a sacrifice, which the Church of England calls a "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving."

## THE LEVITICAL SACRIFICES LITERALLY CONSIDERED.

BY THE

REV. PROFESSOR ALFRED CAVE, B.A.

THAT man of steel, as he was called, Origen, the greatest of the great Fathers of Alexandria, had, to judge from his Eclogues and his Homilies on Leviticus, a very poor opinion of the literal interpretation of the ritualistic sections of the Book of the Law. The circumstantial and realistic observances of the Jew, based upon an unquestioning acceptance of the Levitical injunctions, were considered by Origen both inappropriate and useless. Nay, the literal interpretation of this diversified rubric made, he thought, cavillers and infidels; for it led some, to use his own words, to "despise the Law as a vile thing unworthy of the Creator," and others to "impiously condemn the Creator himself who could ordain such vile commands." Hence his so-called *spiritual* sense—a gross misnomer, unless the *spiritual* is synonymous with the *imaginative*—was Origen's great panacea for all the apparent inanities of the sacred records, the infallible harmonizer of all its seeming contradictions. And his talented lead has, alas! been followed by only too many eminent successors. It was but an application of the same method of forcibly squaring Law with Gospel, when in the next age such moulders of opinion as Augustine and Ambrose descended—the former to expound in his treatise, 'De Isaak et Anima,' the simple fact of Rebekah's filling her pitcher at the well, as "the soul descending to the fountain of wisdom to draw the discipline of pure knowledge," and the latter to find a reference in circumcision to the resurrection of Christ, *quaes desideria carnalia auferit*. Even when the reign of Augustine in Biblical hermeneutics gave way before the influence of that delicate exegete, Isidore of Hispala, whose work, 'De Allegoriis,' became a type of scriptural exposition in the Middle Ages, it was virtually the same allegorizing principle which was advocated and exemplified. Nor was the case different at the Reformation. When, at that epoch, the close study of Scripture became a vital necessity for the consolidation of belief, the writings of Melancthon and Luther, Zwingli and Calvin, abundantly testify to the predominant fondness for "spiritualizing," whilst the subsequent history of the Lutheran and Reformed Churches further witnesses to the potency of these revered leaders, until *spiritualizing* blossomed into such amusing, if not appalling, extravagances as are to be found in Coccejus and his school. To Lund, for example, Aaron's rod that budded was a type of the rod out of the stem of Jesse; its supernatural greenness was a type of Christ's supernatural conception; the mystery of its sprouting a type of the mystery of the birth of the Son of the Virgin; the night of its blossoming was a type of the night in which the miraculous birth of Christ occurred; there were three things on the rod, after the miracle, which were not there before—leaves, flowers, and fruits, whereby the threefold work of the Redeemer is prefigured; and, not to linger further upon this illustration, in the preservation of the rod within the holy of holies we have foreshadowed, he supposed, the

LEVITICUS.

c

passing of the risen Christ into the heavens, there to await the advent of his elect.<sup>1</sup> Could exegetical caprice go further?

That this "spiritualizing" method of interpretation has fallen somewhat into disrepute is due to an unexpected source of enlightenment. "It is an ill wind that blows no one good," and a more vivid conception of the historical character of the Old Testament has been one of the good things which the ill wind of rationalism, with its microscopic and carping criticism of the letter, has blown to the Christian Church. When the rationalists frigidly maintained that the Old Testament was but a collection of the historical records of Judaism, to be regarded in the same light as a collection of the archives of Greece say, or Rome, the Church could at least cheerfully accept one part of the contention, and believe that the Old Testament was a historical record. Thus the Old Testament came to be studied for itself, as well as for its connection with the New. Thus the Old Testament came to be considered at least as worthy of examination for its own sake, and apart from its relation to Christianity, as the sacred books of Mahomet or Zoroaster, Kakya-Mouni or Buddha. In fact, it is now readily acknowledged that the most repulsive details of the ceremonial law, to say nothing of the splendid eloquence of the prophets, are facts in religious history deserving of close investigation as such. Largely thanks to the indirect influence of the rationalistic movement, the Jews are now seen to have had a distinctive religion of contemporary as well as prospective value.

To trace the outline of that Old Testament faith, to authenticate the credibility and the historical character of its records, to contrast that faith with the other religions of the world, to demonstrate its advance upon the creeds of heathendom and towards the creed of Christ,—such a task of elucidation, comparison, and defence is one of the pressing needs of our day, to be satisfied only by the use of all modern appliances, and in view of all modern scholarship. One prominent phase of that Old Testament religion is that of Mosaism, or the religion of the Hebrews as far as it can be deduced from the Pentateuch. Further, of Mosaism the Levitical sacrifices form no unimportant section. To study the nature and significance of these Levitical sacrifices, as they are in themselves, rather than in their connection with Christianity, is the aim of this introduction. In other words, our purpose is to prosecute the literal interpretation of the injunctions of the Law which bear upon these sacrifices, and to see whether such interpretation will conduct us. The Levitical sacrifices will approve themselves a religious cultus not unworthy to be designated Divine.

The course which will be pursued is as follows. A classification of the Levitical sacrifices will *first* be given. *Next*, some principles will be deduced from the letter of Scripture by which the comprehension of the Levitical sacrifices will be facilitated. *Thirdly*, an application will be made of the principles thus deduced to the elucidation of the entire scheme of the Levitical sacrifices. *Fourthly*, the relation of this sacrificial worship to that of the patriarchal age will be pointed out. *Fifthly*, the relation of this sacrificial worship to the sacrificial views of the New Testament will call for some remark. And *lastly*, a few words may be bestowed upon the bibliography of the subject.

And at this point the writer may advisedly call attention to the different standpoint he here assumes to that occupied in his work upon 'The Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice.' To put that standpoint briefly, he would say that, whereas his view of the Jewish sacrifices was previously more analytic, he aims in this introduction at a synthesis, at building up into a consistent whole the numerous details of the Mosaic ritual, and dis-

<sup>1</sup> Lundius, 'Die alten judischen Heilighümer, Gottesdienste und Gewohnheiten dargestellet.' Hamburg, 1695, 1698, 1704, 1712; edited and annotated by Wolf, in a new edition, issued in 1738.

playing thereby the salient and instructive characteristics of the Levitical sacrificial cultus. Let the writer state, however, once for all, that where he has expressed any details of that cultus in as fitting and accurate language as he is capable of in his earlier work, he has not gone about to seek a new dress for old facts, but has freely used his previous materials. Where, therefore, passages occur in inverted commas, without the mention of the name of an author, it will be understood that the writer quotes from his earlier work.

#### A. THE CLASSIFICATION OF THE LEVITICAL SACRIFICES.

At the outset it is necessary to classify the numerous sacrificial rites of the old covenant with some accuracy. An indispensable preliminary to such a classification is a precise definition of "sacrifice." According to the usage of the Old Testament, the most general term for sacrifice is *qorban*. This word was employed in the Law to describe the genus of which sacrifices of all kinds were species. It is expressly predicated of the burnt offering, the peace offering, the thank offering and the votive offering, the sin offering, the trespass offering, the Passover, the sacrifice of the Nazarite on the expiry or breach of his vow, the whole range of national sacrifices, the firstfruits, and even offerings made to Jehovah of the spoils of battle. *Qorban* is manifestly the generic Hebrew term, equivalent to our English term *sacrifice*. The important thing, therefore, in defining "sacrifice" in a scriptural sense is to ascertain the customary Biblical significance of this term. Not to delay upon philological considerations, which may be studied by the curious in the Appendix to the writer's previously mentioned work, suffice it to say that this Hebrew word is expressly used and translated by an unequivocal Greek word in a passage in the seventh chapter of St. Mark's Gospel. That passage runs thus: "Ἐὰν εἴη τι κινδύνεος τῷ πατρὶ ἢ τῇ μητρὶ· Κορβᾶν, ή ἀποτίνει, δέλλα ἐξ ἑμῶν ἀφεληθῆται·" "If a man shall say to his father or his mother, *Qorban*, that is to say, a gift, by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me" (Mark vii. 11). This "*κορβᾶν*, ή *ἀποτίνει*, δέλλον" settles the meaning of the Hebrew sacrificial technicality once for all, at the same time as the insertion of the Hebrew word throws light upon the unfilial pleading alluded to. *Qorban*, the equivalent of the English word *sacrifice* in general, is a *gift to God*. The usage of the LXX. is identical. A sacrifice in the Levitical sense was a gift, or offering, or presentation made to Jehovah. Ewald was, therefore, perfectly at liberty to call abstinence from labour upon the sabbath a sacrifice of rest; nor would it be inconsistent with the usage of the Pentateuch to call obedience to the legal injunctions concerning the seventh year and the year of jubiles by the name of sacrifice, or to regard a scrupulous adherence to the Levitical laws of food a self-denial of the nature of a sacrifice. In the large majority of cases, however, a distinction was perceptible. A sacrifice, in the legal sense, was, it is true, a presentation to Jehovah. But in the stricter sense of the word a presentation could not be indiscriminately made either as regards time or place. Especially is emphasis laid in the Law upon the place of presentation. It is at the place where Jehovah consents to record his Name, at the one appointed place for Divine worship, that sacrifices in the stricter sense can alone be made. Whilst, therefore, Ewald is etymologically correct, it is doubted by many whether he is not inconsistent with the usage of the Law when he designates those offerings sacrifices which were not presented at the one appointed place where man might meet with his Maker. It is true that the usage for which Ewald contends, according to which prayers, and charity, and abstinence, and obedience, may be termed sacrifices, is common to the books of the prophets and of the New Testament, whereas, on the other hand, the legal application of sacrifice seems to be almost restricted to offerings associated with the courts of the Lord. Kurtz avoids the difficulty by

dividing the Levitical sacrifices into sacrifices in general and altar sacrifices—an unnecessary distinction, apt to conceal their common significance.

Defining sacrifice, then, in accordance with both usage and etymology, as a gift, a presentation to God, a surrender to God of what has cost the offerer something, a material embodiment of the self-sacrificing spirit, and remembering that in the large majority of cases at least these sacrifices were associated with the holy places,—the several ordinances of the Mosaic Law in reference thereto will arrange themselves under the following classes. There were the *national* sacrifices, or those presented in the name of the entire Jewish people by their representatives. There were the *official* sacrifices, or the specific acts of worship by presentation prescribed for the ecclesiastical and political orders. And there were the *personal* sacrifices, which were made by individual suppliants of the Heavenly Majesty. To the enumeration of the several varieties under each of these three divisions we now proceed, after uttering a proviso. When we speak of the Levitical sacrifices we do not mean those which are recorded in Leviticus simply, but those contained in any of the legal portions of the Pentateuch. The Book of Leviticus does not contain the entire Mosaic ritual; its legal provisions are supplemented by parts of Exodus and Numbers. Indeed, it is doubtful whether the sharp separation of the Leviticus from the other parts of the Pentateuch is not of very late date. Apparently, to judge from the Jewish rolls of the Law, what we now call the Book of Leviticus was simply sections twenty-four to thirty-three of the Torah,<sup>1</sup> the first division of the Hebrew Scriptures.

I. THE NATIONAL SACRIFICES. Sacrifice, as a form of Divine worship, was not confined under the Law to individuals, whether among the priests or the populace. The nation as such was identified with sacrificial observances. A national rejoicing was regarded as possible, and therefore a national thank offering. The chosen people were supposed to be collectively capable of humiliation and confession of sin, and therefore of a national atonement. Similarly, a national self-surrender to the will of Jehovah was deemed to be frequently appropriate, and hence national burnt offerings were consumed in the national behalf. This national identification with the Levitical sacrifices is a prominent characteristic of the Jewish Church.

The *national* offerings consisted: 1. Of the *serial* offerings, or those daily, weekly, and monthly sacrifices ordered to be presented in the nation's behalf. 2. Of the *festal* offerings, or the ceremonial appropriate to the several exceptional days of sacrificial observance. 3. Of the offerings for the service of the holy place; and 4. Of some extraordinary offerings instituted in response to a widely felt need for worship or humiliation at extraordinary seasons.

1. *The serial offerings.* Every day, morning and evening, the priests were bidden to effect, in the name of the congregation, the burnt offering of a lamb of a year old, and to present therewith its appropriate meal offering and drink offering (Exod. xxix. 38—42; ch. vi. 1—4; Numb. xxviii. 3—8). The presentation was made according to the customary ritual for burnt offering. From the regularity of its succession this daily burnt offering is also called the "continual" or "continuous" burnt offering (Exod. xxix. 42; Numb. xxviii. 6; comp. Dan. viii. 11). The only additional feature of this daily offering to which attention need be called is the probability of a direct association with the people at large by a peculiarity of ritual. According to rabbinic tradition, the nation was expressly represented in the court of the Lord's house by certain *tzadikim*, or permanent officials, who performed the customary rites of the imposition of their hands upon the victim, and its slaughter. Should this tradition

<sup>1</sup> See 'Commentary upon the Holy Bible,' edited by Canon Cook, 'Leviticus,' vol. i. p. 493.

simply refer to the days of Zerubbabel's temple, still that later practice must point back to some earlier form of national representation.<sup>1</sup>

Every sabbath the daily burnt offering was doubled night and morning (Numb. xxviii. 9, 10).

On the first day of every month, or on the new moon as it was called, two young bullocks, a ram, and seven lambs, with the prescribed meal and drink offerings, were ordered to be offered, in addition to the continuous burnt offering; a kid was also to be killed for a sin offering (Numb. xxviii. 11—15). The new moon was also emphasized by a rousing blast upon the silver trumpets (Numb. x. 10). Further, on the new moon of the seventh month, dignified pre-eminently with the name of the Feast of the Blast of Trumpets, an additional burnt offering was to be made of a bullock, a ram, and seven lambs, in addition, that is, to the offering of the month and the daily burnt offering (ch. xxiii. 23—25; Numb. xxix. 1—6).

2. *The festal offerings.* Following the order of the Levitical calendar, the several festal or solemn seasons were Passover, the Paschal Feast, and Pentecost (or the Passover cycle), and the Day of Atonement, followed by the Feast of Tabernacles (or the cycle of the seventh month).

*The Passover cycle.* Even in the first celebration of the Passover, amidst all the idolatry and hardship of Egypt, there were features of sacrificial import. It was by Divine command that a lamb or kid, a male and physically immaculate, had been slain at sunset in every household, the sacred blood having been sprinkled with hyssop upon the posts and lintels of the front door. Also it was by Divine command that the victim was roasted whole, and hastily partaken of with loins girt and staff in hand. Thus two features—the blood ritual and the sacred feast—were not without their sacrificial reference. And this reference was made yet more distinct when the perpetual celebration of the Passover was enjoined under altered conditions, and when the solemn feast of expectation became the solemn feast of reminiscence. Instead of being slain at home, the Paschal lamb was to be slain in the court of the tabernacle, and instead of being sprinkled upon the doorway of the offerer, it was to be sprinkled upon the altar of burnt offering (comp. Exod. xii.; Deut. xvi. 1—8; 2 Chron. xxx. 16; xxxv. 11; also Exod. xiii. 3—10; xxxiv. 18—21; ch. xxiii. 4—8; Numb. ix. 1—14; xxviii. 16—25).

On the morning after the Paschal Supper, namely, on the fifteenth of the first month, the Paschal Feast commenced. It lasted seven days, the first day and the last partaking of the character of a sabbath; that is to say, work being interdicted, and a public assembly of the people at the one place of worship enjoined. This feast is known under two names. It is most frequently called in the Pentateuch the Feast of Unleavened Bread, from the circumstance that none but such bread was eaten by command throughout its course. It is once designated the Feast of the Passover in the Pentateuch. In after times these names were retained. At this feast, in addition to the abstention from leaven—itself of sacrificial significance—a peculiar ritual was ordered to be observed. Every day, after the offering of the customary burnt offering, a further offering by fire was made. Two bullocks, a ram, and seven lambs, with their accompanying meal and drink offerings, were to constitute the festal burnt offering, and one goat the sin offering; these offerings being repeated every day of the feast. The second day of the feast was also characterized by an additional act, not a little curious. Being the time of early harvest, a sheaf of the firstfruits was brought to the priest, who “waved” it before the Lord, presenting at the same time a lamb for a burnt offering,

<sup>1</sup> See Carpzov, ‘Apparatus Historico-Criticus Antiquitatum Gentis Hebraicæ’ (1748), pp. 109, 110. Comp. Keil, ‘Handbuch der Bibl. Archäologie,’ sect. 76, 1.

together with a fifth of an ephah of meal and a quarter of a hin of wine (comp. ch. xxiii. 9—14; Numb. xxviii. 17—25).

Fifty days after the Paschal Supper came the Feast of Harvest—to use one of the several designations of the final feast of the Passover cycle—so called from the time of its observance. Another name for this feast was that of Firstfruits, a designation which is self-explanatory. From the fact that seven full weeks were allowed to elapse after the Passover before its celebration, it was also named the Feast of Weeks, or possibly this name refers to the whole period between Passover and Pentecost. The date of its occurrence also explains its later name, just mentioned, of Pentecost. The feast lasted but a day, and partook of the nature of a sabbath. This feast again has a special sacrificial ritual peculiar to itself, consisting of a meal offering, a burnt offering, a sin offering, and a peace offering: the meal offering being two loaves of leavened bread, to be offered as firstfruits; the burnt offering consisting of seven lambs, one ram, and a bullock, together with meal offerings and drink offerings; a kid constituting the sin offering, and two lambs the peace offering. The common details of the ritual of presentation were observed with two exceptions—the two loaves and the two lambs were simply waved before the Lord, and were not consumed by fire; they were “holy to the Lord for the priest” (comp. ch. xxiii. 15—21; Numb. xxviii. 26—31; Deut. xvi. 9—12).

*The cycle of the seventh month.* The seventh month stood out in strong relief in the Jewish calendar. It opened, as we have seen, with the Feast of Trumpets, as if to awaken the nation year by year to the high importance of the days in which its lot was cast, and continued with blended solemnity and rejoicing, bringing in due course the great Day of Atonement, upon the tenth of the month, and the Feast of Tabernacles, or Ingathering, upon the fifteenth.

The ritual of the Day of Atonement was peculiarly sacrificial, and although there is combined therein not only offerings referring to national sins, but those of an official nature, it may tend to clearness if that ritual be described in order once for all. “The law concerning the Day of Atonement contains instruction as to the performance of the appropriate ritual, and as to its performance annually. The prescribed ritual was as follows: As a sacrifice for the priesthood, the high priest was to bring a sin offering of a bullock and a burnt offering of a ram; and as a sacrifice for the congregation, a sin offering of two he-goats and a burnt offering of a ram. The priest was to be clothed, not in his state costume, but in a dress entirely of white, to be put on after bathing the whole body, and not simply the hands and feet as customarily. This dress of white was not even the plain official dress of the ordinary priesthood, for that had a coloured girdle. Lots were then cast upon the two he-goats—one lot for Jehovah and one for Azazel; and, according as the lots fell, so were they presented as living sacrifices before the altar. The ceremony of the expiation of the priesthood and the holy places then commenced. The bullock having been slain as a sin offering for himself and his house, the high priest filled the censer with embers from the altar of burnt offering and with incense, and placed the censer within the vail. Some of the blood of the ox was then sprinkled upon the mercy-seat and seven times upon the ground. Atonement was afterwards made for the nation. The he-goat was slain, and its blood, having been taken into the holiest, was sprinkled as the blood of the ox had previously been. The floor of the holy place was next sprinkled with blood, and the altars of incense and burnt offering. The expiation of the priesthood, tabernacle, and nation being now performed, an exquisitely symbolic act of forgiveness was gone through. The high priest placed both his hands upon the head of the live goat, confessed over it all the sins and transgressions of the people, and sent it away by a man who was standing ready into the desert. The high priest then removed his white garments, purified

himself at the laver, and, having donned his official robes, offered the burnt offerings for himself and the people."

Further, the Feast of Tabernacles, time of wild and often libidinous rejoicing as it was, had its specific ritual of gifts and atonement, adjusted to the several days during which it lasted. Seven days long were the booths standing in the sacred court, and a kind of retrogression was observed in the sacrificial procedure. As on the other fast days, a goat was daily offered as a sin offering. The number of rams and lambs was doubled, being two and fourteen respectively. But it was in the number of bullocks that the distinguishing feature of the feast appeared. Seventy bullocks in all were offered, these being so distributed that, on the last day of the feast, seven were slain, eight on the day preceding, nine on the day previous to that, and so on, daily increasing by one until the total reached thirteen, the proportion slaughtered on the first day (comp. Exod. xxiii. 16; ch. xxiii. 34—43; Numb. xxix. 12—38; Deut. xvi. 13—16; xxxi. 10—13).

3. *The offerings for the service of the holy place.* These offerings consisted of the holy oil for the daily replenishing of the lamps of the golden candlesticks, arranged "from evening to morning" by the priesthood; of the incense, peculiarly compounded, and daily burnt upon the golden altar; and of the twelve loaves, arranged in rows, with frankincense and libations of wine, to judge from the furniture of the table of shew-bread, which were laid before the Lord as a memorial at the beginning of every week, and eaten by the priests as "a most holy thing" at the close. In the present reference, the significant fact in connection with these offerings is that they were national rather than official, to say nothing of personal. For the materials thereof were selected from offerings representatively made by the people. Thus it is the children of Israel, and not the priests, who are bidden to bring pure olive oil for the lamps of the sanctuary. It would seem also that the constituents of the sacred incense were the gift of the people, seeing that in the first instance they were ordered to be provided by Moses, the representative of the tribes at large rather than of Levi. And, as regards the shew-bread, conceding that the number of its loaves did not point to the number of the tribes, as seems probable, it is expressly said, "every sabbath it shall be presented before Jehovah continually *on the part of the sons of Israel*, an eternal covenant" (ch. xxiv. 8). Compare on the above statements, Exod. xxvii. 20; ch. xxiv. 2; Exod. xxx. 34—38; xxv. 30; ch. xxiv. 5—8; Numb. iv. 7; Exod. xxvii. 12.

4. *The extraordinary offerings.* Amongst these offerings, in which we see the general theory of Old Testament sacrifice applied to unlooked-for waves of national sentiment, whether penitential or eucharistic, may be classed such abnormal offerings as those for the erection of the tabernacle; those at the consecration of Aaron; the surrender of their mirrors by the Hebrew women for the manufacture of the brazen laver; the sin offerings presented by the congregation in acknowledgment of some special sin of national bearing, such as the crimes of Korah and Achan; or the multitude of sacrifices slaughtered at the consecration of the temple. A very interesting series of instances, showing as they do a trial of old ordinances in new conditions, an application of the Law to changed circumstances, an apprehension of the spirit which is nobler than an obedience to the letter; and suggesting, as they undoubtedly do suggest, a variety of possible adaptations of the Law to religious ends not expressly contemplated.

II. THE OFFICIAL SACRIFICES. Not only did the officials of the Jewish nation act as the religious representatives of the tribes in the manner just described, not only did they approach the Majesty on high as individual suppliants in the manner about to be described, but, according to the dictates of the Mosaic Law, there were sacrificial rites

administered by them, neither in their representative nor in their individual capacity, but purely as officials. These rites pertained to the officials of Church and State and society at large, and may be conveniently classified according as they attached to the priests, the kings, the elders, and the ministering women.

1. *The priestly offerings.* Quite apart from their almost endless duties as the religious executive of the Israelites, there was a distinctive sacrificial cultus which belonged to the priests in their exceptional official functions. The following enumeration is exhaustive. There were special sin offerings to be made by any priest who had inadvertently erred in the discharge of his holy calling (ch. iv. 3). There was a specific offering of meal to be made by the high priest daily, morning and evening, within the outer vail (ch. vi. 14). The solemn expiation of the great Day of Atonement opened, as we have seen, with an atonement for the officiator and the whole priestly order. At the consecration of any high priest, priest, or Levite, characteristic offerings were enjoined, varying in costliness and manner in each case. Thus at the consecration of a Levite, the lowest grade in the hierarchy, there was a consecration itself called a sacrifice (Numb. viii. 13); after a process of purification, two young bullocks were offered, the one for a sin offering and the other for a burnt offering (Numb. viii. 5—26). At the consecration of a priest, the intermediate ecclesiastical grade, two sets of three acts were performed: in the first place, the novice was specially purified, solemnly invested, and religiously anointed; and in the second place, a triple sacrifice was presented in his behalf, consisting of a bullock for a sin offering, a ram for a burnt offering, and a ram for a peace offering (Exod. xxiv. 1—37; xl. 12—15; ch. viii. 1—36). At the consecration, however, of the “anointed priest,” or “the priest” *par excellence*, afterwards called the “high priest,” a more elaborate ceremonial still was ordained, occupying seven days instead of one, and, whilst consisting of the same series of acts—purification, investiture, anointing, and sacrifice, this last act showing as clearly as the investiture with the “golden garments” the exalted rank of the person concerned—whereas for an ordinary priest one bullock formed a sin offering, for a high priest seven bullocks were offered on successive days. A further evidence of his exalted position may be seen in the sin offering to be made by the high priest upon any infringement of his official duty. “He was to offer an ox without blemish. Having performed the presentation, the imposition of the hand, and the slaughtering in the customary manner, he took a part of the blood into the tabernacle, and sprinkled it seven times ‘in the face of the vail of the holy,’ and having put some of the blood upon the horns of the altar of incense, he poured out the remainder at the bottom of the altar of burnt offering. The same fatty portions which were removed in the case of the peace offerings were afterwards lifted off the carcase and consumed above the daily burnt offering, the high priest carrying the rest of the carcase to a clean place before the camp, and burning it on wood with fire.” A ceremonial of highly significant variations!

2. *The offerings of the princes and the ruler.* Express mention is made of elaborate offerings made at the dedication of the tabernacle “by the princes of Israel, heads of the house of their fathers”—gold and silver utensils, a goat apiece for a sin offering, and large burnt offerings and peace offerings (Numb. vii. 10—89). Express mention is also made of a sin offering for a ruler, whether judge or king (ch. iv. 22—26). Remembering, however, the special offerings of David and Solomon on set occasions, it would appear that the offerings just mentioned are simply instances of an adaptation of the sacrificial cultus to the sanctification of the chief officers of the State, and instances which any occasion of great penitence or gratitude might constitute into an inspiring precedent.

3. *The offerings of the holy women.* In this case again we seem merely to have an instance of a class of presentations capable of infinite repetition by sections of Jewish society. These holy women "served at the door of the tabernacle" (Exod. xxxviii. 8; 1 Sam. ii. 22), not assisting, of course, in any of the ritual prescribed for the priests or Levites, but abiding apparently in a holy ministration of prayer and praise, fasting and sacrifice, like the saintly daughter of Phanuel; at least, such is the interpretation of these holy attendants suggested by the Septuagint, the Targum of Onkelos, Jerome, and many rabbis, as shown by Münster and Fagius in the 'Critici Sacri.'

III. THE PERSONAL OFFERINGS. These are divisible into two classes—the *blood* and the *bloodless* sacrifices, the former including the burnt offerings, the peace offerings, the sin and the trespass offerings; and the latter including the meat, or the meal, offerings, as they are better termed, the libations, the offerings of oil and incense, and a variety of oblations, such as the redemption moneys for every Israelite, the tithes, the firstlings, and the vows. Of these two classes in order; certain modifications of the blood and bloodless sacrifices under special circumstances may then be appended.

1. *The blood sacrifices. The burnt offerings.* Two points call for notice, namely, the injunctions concerning the victims to be slain, and those concerning the ritual to be observed in slaying. The victims varied with the wealth of the offerers. If the offerer was poor, a turtle-dove or pigeon sufficed to neutralize the command not "to appear before the Lord empty," and in the presentation of this humblest offering the officiating priest simply cleaned the birds and burnt them upon the accustomed altar. Richer offerings were such as an ox, a ram, or a goat, in the transformation of either of which into a sweet savour a more elaborate ritual was observed. This ritual is described at length because it was adopted in all burnt offerings, whether national, official, or personal. "The victim was brought to the altar by the offerer, who then forcibly laid his hand upon the animal's head, and slaughtered it upon the north side. In the act of slaughtering, the blood was caught by the priest and swung against the four walls of the altar. The offerer then flayed the slaughtered animal, divided it, cleansed the intestines and the lower parts of the legs; whereupon the officiating priest, appropriating the skin, placed the several parts, with the head and fat, in order upon the wood, which had been previously arranged upon the ever-burning fire, and the whole sacrifice rose 'as an offering of fire of a sweet savour unto Jehovah.'" A meal offering and a drink offering always accompanied this form of sacrifice (comp. ch. i.).

*The peace offerings.* In this case also emphasis must be laid upon the victims and the mode. With respect to the former, it might be a bull, a cow or a calf, a ram, a sheep or a lamb, a he-goat or a she-goat, the selection being regulated by the purse and the inclination of the offerer. As for the ritual, which *mutatis mutandis* was also observed in all the varieties of the peace offering, national, official, or individual, it in part resembled and in part differed from that of the burnt offering. "The victim having been brought to the altar, the offerer laid his hand upon its head, slaughtered it (but apparently not on the north side)—the priest meanwhile catching the blood and sprinkling it upon the altar—flayed, divided, and cleansed it. The course subsequently followed was essentially different from that employed for the burnt offering. Instead of burning the animal entire, the offerer detached all the separable portions of fat, such as the flare, and that in which the intestines, kidneys, and liver are embedded; and in the case of sheep severed the fat tail; these portions were then burnt with the daily burnt offering. The breast was afterwards 'waved' by a kind of horizontal movement, and given to the Aaronites, and the right leg was lifted or 'heaved off' as a gift to the officiating priest. The remains of the carcase were carried away by the offerer, and a meal made of it in the sacred precincts of the tabernacle.

Meat and drink offerings accompanied this form of sacrifice, one of the cakes of the meal offering always falling to the priest." Three occasions for the presentation of peace offerings are expressly mentioned: they might be made at special seasons of gratitude, and were then called thank offerings; they were presented when vows were made before the Lord, and were then called votive offerings; or they were voluntarily made at any time when there was a longing for the fellowship of Jehovah, being then called voluntary offerings. The laws of the peace offering are given in chs. iii. and vii. 11-36.

*The sin offerings.* Some of the characteristic features of the sin offering have been already passed under review in connection with the national and official offerings, and it has already become evident that the *differentia* of this class of sacrifices was to be found in a peculiar manipulation of the blood of the animal slaughtered. This fact becomes very evident indeed when we turn to the regulations concerning the individual sin offerings. "When a ruler or common Israelite sinned through ignorance, they were ordered to bring, on becoming conscious of their fault, the ruler an immaculate he-goat, and the Israelite an immaculate shaggy she-goat; in both cases the offerer then went through the customary process of laying on the hand and slaying, upon which the priest, having collected the blood, smeared some upon the horns of the altar, poured out the rest at the foot, and burnt the whole of the fat upon the hearth; the carcase fell to the priest. The sin offerings were slain where the burnt offerings were. It is also noteworthy that, whilst many victims might be offered as a burnt offering, the sin offering might never consist of more animals than one." It will be perceived upon a comparison of the several forms of sin offering, that the ritual observed was always the same in certain important points, such as the manipulation with the blood, the burning of the fatty portions, and the destination of the carcase (which always fell to the priest, either for his own use or to burn without the camp). For the law of the sin offering, consult ch. iv.

*The trespass offerings.* However similar in name, these formed a class quite distinct from the preceding class, and this distinction must be considered later on. At present it is sufficient to tabulate, as has been done in the other three classes, the sort of victims presented and the manner of their presentation. "In all cases the offering consisted of a ram, the blood of which, after the customary presentation, imposition of hands, and slaughtering, instead of being smeared upon the horns of the altar or taken into the holy place like the blood of the sin offerings, was simply swung against the side of the altar, the ritual being thenceforth the same as for the sin offering either of a ruler or common Israelite. This class of sacrifice was always accompanied by a recompense, which was considered as due to God and man; the discharge of the debt to God being effected by the placing by the priest of a fancy value upon the offered ram equivalent to the wrong done; and the human liability being discharged by the payment to the party wronged of the whole amount of the fraud, *increased by a retributory fifth.*" The laws of the trespass offerings are given in chs. v. 14, etc., and vi. 1-7.

2. *The bloodless sacrifices.* These include the so-called meat offerings, the tithes and the firstfruits, both of which were solemnly presented before the Lord at the altar of burnt offering and consecrated by a solemn dedication by fire of part to the Lord, and the other bloodless sacrifices which were not presented at the altar. Of these only the first class call for any further remarks.

The *meat offerings* were so called in the Authorized Version because meal was the staple food of the sixteenth century. Times and customs have now changed, and the word "meat" refers now to animal rather than vegetable food. It is now, therefore,

advisable to speak of *meal* offerings, not *meat* offerings. These offerings were the Levitical vegetable sacrifices, and were preceded, with two exceptions—the daily offering of the high priest and that which was substituted by the poor for the burnt offering—by some form of blood sacrifice, either a burnt offering or a peace offering. “They consisted of fine wheaten flour, or of cakes of the same, variously prepared with oil, according to the culinary arts of the Jews, some being baked in a small oven like the Arab’s *tannur*, some being prepared on plates, and some in a skillet; they also occasionally consisted of roasted ears of corn. To all these ‘meat offerings’ oil and salt were added, and to those which consisted of flour or grain incense also. . . . The ritual of presentation was very simple. The offerer brought the offering to the priest, who took a handful of the meal and oil with the incense, and burnt them on the altar, the remainder falling to the priest as ‘a thing most holy.’”

3. *Certain modifications of the two previous classes enjoined under special circumstances.* Not merely did the Law contain directions for individual sacrifices such as have been already described, but some specific adaptations were enjoined of the sacrificial ritual, in order to expressly connect certain states of mind and body with the scenic worship of the sanctuary. The occasion for these modified forms of ritual were the following; they are simply named for the most part, and the references given to the Law for fuller details:—

*Upon contact with a corpse* (see Numb. xix. and comp. ‘Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice,’ p. 74).

*Upon the cure of a leper.* The purification of a restored leper was divided into two series of acts performed after an interval of seven days, being at both times a modified sacrificial ritual (comp. ch. xiv. and ‘Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice,’ p. 75).

*After parturition.* The mother who had recovered from childbirth must present herself with a sacrifice at the altar (see ch. xii. 1—8).

*After cessation of derangement of sexual organs* (see ch. xv. 1—15; 25—30).

*In connection with the Nazarite vow.* This vow of abstinence and continency was itself a form of sacrifice. It was also directly associated with the sacrificial ritual. Upon any unintentional defilement of a Nazarite by sudden death in his company, an offering was to be made of two doves, or pigeons, by way of atonement, and a lamb was to be brought as a trespass offering. There was also a peculiar rite to celebrate the expiry of his vow (comp. Numb. vi. 13—21).

*At the so-called trial of jealousy*, a solemn ordeal, by which conjugal infidelity was submitted to an awful sacrificial test. The suspicious husband brought the wife to the priest, together with an offering of barley meal, without oil or incense. The ordeal was this. The priest, taking some holy water from the laver, apparently in an earthen vessel in which he had mixed a little dust from the sacred court, and placing the meal in the woman’s hand, swore the woman according to an appalling formula, to which he says, “Amen, amen.” Further, he wrote the formula in a book, and, having blotted it out with the holy water, caused the woman to drink the water. Nor was the ordeal even yet complete. There was a subsequent waving of the meal before the Lord, a burning of it upon the altar, and a second potation of the holy water. With this result, the thigh of the perjured woman rotted (see Numb. v. 11—31).

#### B. SCRIPTURAL PRINCIPLES APPLICABLE TO THE ELUCIDATION OF THE LEVITICAL SACRIFICES.

To the Christian mind, accustomed to accept instinctively as fundamental postulates the spirituality and universality of worship, it might well seem at first sight that so costly and complicated a ritual as has just been described was something less than

Divine. Origen's dilemma, that this cultus by presentation is either unworthy of its Creator, or its Creator is himself unworthy, seems to have some reason on its side. Nor does his escape from the dilemma appear at first blush irrational; it may seem better to some to inquire as to what these laws may be made to mean, rather than to investigate minutely what they seem to mean. Nevertheless, in real truth, it is needless to constitute one's self a pupil of the philosophical eunuch of Alexandria. Ascetic rebellion against the actual condition of life providentially arranged for us is not the highest mark of sanctified wisdom, and quite another method of escape than Origen's from the danger of the flesh may be pursued both in morals and in religion. As marriage may afford finer scope for the spiritual culture of life than celibacy, so a patient study of the reputed materialism of the Levitical sacrifices may issue in a more spiritual view of the Divine dealings than spiritualizing falsely so called. A little care and attention bestowed upon the actual teachings of Scripture show an exquisite adaptation to the needs of the Jew in the process of discipline to which he was divinely submitted. Indeed, a rational interpretation of the language of Scripture will elevate the Levitical cultus into so splendid an agent in the religious development of the chosen people, as not to be derogatory to Deity himself. At least, so we hope to show by an examination into the early records of the Pentateuch. By the sacrifice and offering which Jehovah did not for himself desire, he yet satisfactorily educated, as we shall see, a people to whom the higher revelation in the body could be made. Nay, however Judaism may fall short of Christianity, it is beyond all comparison with any other religious system developed during the world's course. A worship which could train and satisfy a David and an Isaiah, a Jeremiah and an Ezekiel, must be pre-eminent amongst the non-Christian faiths. The task we now place before ourselves, therefore, is to educe from the Old Testament certain general principles which may be applied to the comprehension of the Levitical sacrifices. What light the Jew had upon the rites he was bidden to perform, we are now to gather into a focus. If the labour be great, it will not be unremunerative; in this toil, too, there will be profit. The inquiry will conveniently range itself under the following heads: We shall first elicit from Scripture some fundamental ideas common to the whole of the Levitical sacrifices; we shall next investigate the significance attached by Scripture to the varied, yet ordained, ritual of those sacrifices; thirdly, we shall ascertain the meaning associated by Scripture with the several varieties of these sacrifices; and lastly, we shall consider the significance of the several feasts and fasts to the celebration of which the sacrificial ritual was accommodated. These details settled, it will then be possible to regard the Levitical sacrifices as a whole. The application of these leading principles to the multitudinous injunctions previously classified will then be easy, and the result, it is believed, will be at once stimulating to faith and evocative of devout thankfulness.

Here a caution may be not unwisely interpolated. It possibly calls for explicit statement that, when we speak of scriptural principles of sacrifices and of principles deducible from the Scriptures, we do not refer to proof texts merely. The interpretation and application of Scripture is not so facile. However poorly the writer has succeeded in his aim, that aim itself is to base the interpretation of the Levitical sacrifices upon a series of complete inductions from the scriptural data, including, as they do, the implications of philology and the suggestions of general usage, possibly the hints derivable from a trained sense, as well as the numerous passages for which chapter and verse can be given. Scriptural archæology is only inexpugnable when it consists of perfect inductions from Scripture, and perfect inductions must summarize tenor in addition to positive statements of facts.

1. *Certain fundamental ideas common to the Levitical sacrifices. The idea underlying*

*the generic term "gorban."* After what has been already said upon the meaning and Biblical usage of this term for all forms of sacrifice, whether bloodless or marked by the effusion of blood, whether presented at the altar or without discrimination of place, little further need be added. All the Levitical sacrifices were gifts to Jehovah. They gave tangible expression to the innate sentiments of every worshipper down to the lowest grade of the fetishist, that it is necessary to attest the self-denial of his soul by some gift which the hand can bring; a sentiment which Jehovah not only sanctioned in the Jew, but demanded when he said, "Thou shalt not appear before me empty." He who brought a *gorban* made a *presentation*. Undoubtedly the problem of the Levitical sacrifices is like one of those intricate locks which only a combination of keys can open. One master-key has been discovered in this idea of *gorban*. Whatever else the Levitical sacrifices were, they were presentations to Jehovah, sacrifices symbolic of self-sacrifice.

*The idea underlying the term "kipper" and its several forms.* This technical term and its derivatives are translated in the Authorized Version by *atone* and its derivatives. Without discussing the primary significance of the word,<sup>1</sup> suffice it to say that "atone" in its scriptural sense means "to cover sin," in other words, to neutralize or conceal sin so that it should not offend the Deity—to render the Divine wrath inoperative. To make an atonement, if we probe the Hebrew figure, "was to throw, so to speak, a veil over sin so dazzling that the veil and not the sin was visible, or to place side by side with sin something so attractive as to completely engross the eye. The figure which the New Testament uses when it speaks of the 'new robe,' the Old Testament uses when it speaks of atonement. When an atonement was made under the Law, it was as though the Divine eye, which had been kindled at the sight of sin and foulness, was now quieted by the garment thrown around it; or, to use a figure much too modern, yet equally appropriate, it was as if the sinner, who had been exposed to the lightning of the Divine wrath, had been suddenly wrapped round and insulated." So much for the idea of the word. In addition, let the precise association of the idea be remembered. This idea of *atonement* is expressly associated with the *blood* of the sacrifices in an important passage: "For the soul," it is said, in ch. xvii. 11, "of the flesh is in the blood, and I (the Lord) have given it you upon the altar to be an atonement for your souls: for the blood it atones by the soul." In other words, to avoid the lengthy controversy connected with this passage, it is at least alleged that the blood of every animal sacrifice has been appointed by God, for some reason of his own, as a means of neutralizing the sin of the Jew, because the blood is the life of the animal sacrificed. Four truths thus emerge, viz. first, the Levitical sacrifices had a power of atonement; secondly, that atonement was connected only with the blood sacrifices; thirdly, it was the effusion of blood which was declared to be a neutralizing of sin; and fourthly, this act of atonement was an act of substitution, that is to say, a forfeited human life was spared because of an animal life surrendered. Of course, we are not arguing either the reasonableness or irrationality of this fact; it is our present purpose simply to state it. Thus the second master-key to the Levitical sacrifices has been obtained. But although, to continue the figure, the door into the mysterious chamber is opened, the only available light is that which has followed our entrance; there are many windows to be unbarred and blinds to be lifted before the entire chamber is visible to its remotest corner and most secret recess. To this unbarring and illuminating we must now proceed.

*The significance of the materials used in sacrifice.* As our previous classification has shown, these materials were divisible into animal and non-animal offerings, or, to adopt

<sup>1</sup> 'Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice,' pp. 482—486.

the yet more significant technicalities, into blood and bloodless offerings. The ideas already educed render the interpretation of these two classes of material easy. The bloodless offerings were presentations simply; they were gifts made to Jehovah upon approach to him in worship; they were this and nothing more. The blood sacrifices were this *and* something more; they were both presentations and instruments of atonement; in addition to being the gifts of the offerer to Jehovah, they possessed the all-important blood which testified to the substituted life. In every case of animal sacrifice the blood spilt spoke of a substituted life, whilst in every case also the animal itself, of some value to the offerer, spoke of a presentation made. And it is this latter fact which elucidates another point in the ceremonial of animal sacrifice, namely, the variety and the kind of victims enjoined. Offerings were only to be made of such animals as did not contradict the Levitical laws of food—of such animals, therefore, as Jehovah could receive. Further, the victims were of very different value; a bullock was worth more than a cow, a cow than a calf, a calf than a ram, a ram than a sheep, a sheep than a lamb, a lamb than a pigeon, and a pigeon than a handful of meal; the gradation of animal became a gradation of gift. The more costly the gift the more self-sacrificing the offering.

*The significance of the place of sacrifice.* In the patriarchal age, it would appear, any place might be a place of special Divine revelation, and therefore a place where an altar might be erected; in the Levitical code, the legitimate place of sacrifice was more restricted. The large majority of offerings, as our previous description has already made evident, were ordered to be presented within the precincts of the one spot which Jehovah had consecrated by his presence. As it is said in Deut. xii. 5, 6, “But unto the place which the Lord your God shall choose out of all your tribes to put his Name there, even unto his habitation shall ye seek, and thither thou shalt come: and thither ye shall bring your burnt offerings, and your sacrifices, and your tithes, and heave offerings of your hand, and your vows, and your freewill offerings, and the firstlings of your herds and of your flocks.” And yet again, in vers. 13, 14, “Take heed to thyself that thou offer not thy burnt offerings in every place that thou seest: but in the place which the Lord shall choose in one of thy tribes, there thou shalt offer thy burnt offerings, and there thou shalt do all that I command thee.” And still more solemnly is the same injunction conveyed in ch. xvii. 3—9, “What man soever there be of the house of Israel, that killeth an ox, or lamb, or goat, in the camp, or that killeth it out of the camp, and bringeth it not unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, to offer an offering unto the Lord before the tabernacle of the Lord; blood shall be imputed unto that man; he hath shed blood; and that man shall be cut off from among his people: to the end that the children of Israel may bring their sacrifices, which they offer in the open field, even that they may bring them unto the Lord, unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, unto the priest, and offer them for slain offerings unto the Lord,” etc. If apparent exceptions are seen in the case of Gideon, Manoah, David, and Elijah, it needs to be remembered that their aberrant practice was sanctioned by express Divine revelations; and so little was their example regarded as a type of permissible action, that when the Reubenites wished to build a second altar, all Israel grew furious, and was ready to put two tribes and a half to the sword. It is therefore evident that immense importance was attached under the Law to the place of sacrifice. That place was ordered in such a way that it always fell somewhere within the one sanctuary; and very significantly so, for there Jehovah was supposed and stated to be peculiarly present and approachable. There was a certain localization of the Deity according to the Mosaic Law, and the neighbourhood of the Shechinah was holy ground, as the Law itself represents Jehovah as saying. “And there I will

meet" are the words of the Lord at the ordinance of the perpetual burnt offering at the door of tabernacle, "And there I will meet with the children of Israel, and the tabernacle shall be sanctified by my glory. And I will sanctify the tabernacle of the congregation, and the altar: I will sanctify also both Aaron and his sons, to minister to me in the priest's office. And I will dwell among the children of Israel, and will be their God" (Exod. xxix. 43, 44). Let it be noted, however, that, whilst the whole sanctuary was the abode of Jehovah, approach to him was limited by two conditions: first, certain sections of the sanctuary were allotted to certain sections of the people, the high priest alone being allowed to enter the holy of holies, the priests' peculiar portion being the holy place, and the court being apportioned to the Jew; and secondly, the altars were, so to speak, the centres of the several sections, in which their significance was concentrated and from which their power radiated.

Thus we have express scriptural authority for saying that the various offerings were to be presented within the precincts of the holy place, each according to the status of the worshipper, because there Jehovah, the covenant God, had consented to reveal his Name, and be peculiarly present.

*The significance of the officiating priests.* Not only was the large majority of sacrifices ordered to be made at a certain place, but by the mediation of a certain ecclesiastical executive. The Jews at large were not priests unto God, they did their priestcraft by deputy; and from the days of their unanimous refusal of the more exalted office of Divine administration, the tribe of Levi was set apart for holy service. The preceding description of the legal commands has already shown how large a part the priest played in sacrificial worship, how minute a rubric instructed the priest in the dutiful discharge of his sacred functions. For our present purpose, the tribe of Levi as a whole may be ignored; it is simply needful to concentrate attention upon the priests proper, the descendants of Aaron, and their official head, the so-called high priest. Had the fact of the mediation of priests any doctrine to convey to the reverent and thoughtful worshipper? Most assuredly. The priests were middle-men; they had an exceptional privilege of Divine approach; they represented God to man, and man to God. Every sacrifice presented through the priest was presented to Jehovah by the appointed medium of legal access.

2. *The significance of the several details of the sacrificial ritual.* It is next necessary to consider the significance of the curious and precise ritual ordered to be adopted in sacrificial worship, and to see whether and how far religious truths were taught thereby. It will be seen that no prescribed act was meaningless, and that each stage in the elaborate act of worship had its own message to convey.

*The act of presentation.* The first stage in every act of sacrifice was the deliberate presentation of the offerer and his gift at the appropriate altar. Entrance into the court of the Lord's house was not casual or heedless, but of set purpose. The offerer presented himself and his offering solemnly before the priest. Nor was this presentation a mere opportunity for an official examination into the fulfilment of the legal conditions of valid sacrifice, although the officiating priest was unquestionably bound to see that the victim had neither spot nor blemish nor any such thing. The presentation was itself a thoughtful religious act. Of what nature? Without entering upon the various replies which have been returned by Neumann, Keil, Kliefoth, Kurtz, and Wangemann, suffice it to say that the *thebiah* was a symbolical prayer for the privileges accruing to legal sacrifice. To come to the altar was to come to the Lord; to come with a willing and obedient mind, fulfilling the conditions of the Law, was to ask for a share in the promises thereto attached.

*The imposition of the hand.* The victim having been solemnly presented, "the

offerer forcibly laid his hand upon its head; his hand, not his slave's; his hand, not his substitute's, nor his wife's, but his own hand"—to retranslate what Outram extracted from the Talmud. There was a forcible imposition of the hand upon the head of the victim by the offerer, whoever he might be, whether priest or layman, king or elder. And this act was singularly eloquent. Again refraining from entering into the protracted controversy as to the meaning of the rite (discussed in the writer's previous work), suffice it to say that this act was a dedication of the victim to the purpose for which it was brought. Perfunctory worship Jehovah would not have, and as the deliberate act of presentation kept the mind of the offerer awake to the importance of the rite in which he was engaging, so the deliberate act of the imposition of the hand kept the mind awake to the same great object. Just as the presentation said, "This is my deliberate act," so the imposition of the hand implied, "This is my deliberate gift."

*The act of slaughter.* This, be it observed, was always performed by the offerer (possibly assisted or guided by the Levites), and hence its significance. In offering an animal, he was bringing before God an atonement as well as a presentation. But atonement was by the blood, not by the living animal. Whilst, therefore, sacrifice as a gift was complete when the victim was dedicated to sacred purposes in the two first ritual acts already described and explained, sacrifice as an atonement was not complete until the blood was given to the priest. In the act of slaughter by his own hand, the offerer obediently brought before God the blood of atonement. The slaughtering was important as the consummation of the act of sacrifice by the presentation of the atoning blood before the Lord.

*The heaving and waving.* Sometimes a peculiar swinging of the offering was appended to the other acts of presentation, called "heaving" and "waving" (*therumah* and *thenupha*). This detail was enjoined in the consecration of the Levites and priests, in the vow of the Nazarite, in the offering of jealousy, in the cleansing of the leprous, in the thank offerings and the tithes. Nor are the movements themselves difficult to trace. "Heaving" was a perpendicular motion from below upwards, a swinging from earth towards heaven. "Waving" has been very differently understood. Some of the early Protestant expositors regarded "waving" as making the sign of the cross, in which they found some mysterious reference to the crucifixion of Jesus; Hengstenburg and Bähr accept this interpretation whilst rejecting the inference. Gesenius, Thalhofer, Keil, Knobel, Schultz, and Oehler seem to regard *thenupha* as a mere synonym of *theviah*, and as forming no distinct part of the ceremonial; in which view there is both truth and falsity, the "waving" being assuredly a part of the act of presentation, but a part of the ritual distinctly emphasized. As Wangemann has pointed out, the compilers of the Mishna—no mean authorities on the details of ancient worship—regard this movement of *heniyah* as a "going and coming," as if "waving" were a horizontal movement backwards and forwards. With this certain passages in the Old Testament coincide. Thus Isaiah calls the swinging of an axe "waving," as also the angry shake of the threatening finger. On the whole, therefore, this significant act of the officiator would seem to be a more emphatic presentation. The priest took the offering and "heaved" it towards heaven, as if presenting it to the Deity who had made the heavens his throne, and then returned the gift to the altar by a "waving" process, which only differed from the reverse of "heaving" by the exercise of force to counteract gravity, and place the limb or the firstfruits, for example, upon the altar.

*The significance of the manipulations with the blood.* Although this act varied in the several kinds of sacrifice, it was nevertheless invariably a more or less complete pouring forth of the life-blood before the Lord. The rabbinical interpreters of the Law divided the manipulation in question into three acts—*lekicha*, *serika*, and *shepicha*. To

the collection of the blood in a silver bowl they gave the name of *lechicha*; the application of the blood so reserved to the altar they called *serika*; and the pouring out of the superfluous blood at the runnel of the altar, whence it flowed into the brook Kedron, they designated *shepicha*. This triple division is useful as showing the stages of the customary procedure. It was the second stage which was manifestly the important one, the first being a mere preliminary, and the third a mere consequent thereto. This *serika*, or sprinkling, varied with the sacrifice, sometimes being a sprinkling of the surface of the brazen altar, sometimes a smearing of the horns, and sometimes a general aspersion of all the holy places and their sacred utensils. It was always, however, a bringing of blood in contact with the altar, and thus before Jehovah. Upon the significance of this repulsive proceeding to modern eyes we are left in no doubt. The interpretation thereof is given in the passage which has already been quoted (ch. xvii. 11), and concerning which, however interpreters may vary as to its exact purport, all are agreed that it defines the use of blood in the Law. "For the soul of the flesh," it runs, "is in the blood: and I (the Lord) have given it you upon the altar to be an atonement for your souls: for the blood atones by the soul." In other words, this verse asserts that the blood of the animal legally presented has been appointed by God as a means of atonement for human life, because that blood is really the life of the animal sacrificed, or, to put the same thing in other words, the blood or life of an animal has been graciously accepted by Jehovah (for some reason or other, and by some means or other) as a valid substitute for the life or blood of the sinful offerer. As Kahnis puts it, blood is life *in compendio*. By the blood manipulation one part of the twofold aim of animal sacrifice was completed, and a legal atonement was made for human sin.

*The significance of the combustion upon the altar.* In the blood manipulation, as has just been observed, the atoning aspect of animal sacrifices was complete; the two remaining rites were connected with the offerings as gifts to God. There was in every case a burning of the carcase, wholly or in part; this was the first of the remaining acts. The symbolism of this combustion is manifest. It was a sending of the gift to God. After arranging the divided or the selected portions of the carcase in the heaven-born fire, which had issued forth from the Divine presence at the consecration of the tabernacle, and had never been permitted to altogether expire, they were burned, that is to say, they were etherealized, and they rose to heaven as "a sweet savour." The rite bore a similar interpretation when it had reference to any of the bloodless offerings. To burn was to effectually present.

*The significance of the concluding meal.* In all offerings but the holocausts and certain forms of the sin offerings, the ritual ended in a sacrificial meal, enjoyed for the most part by the priesthood, but occasionally—that is to say, in the case of peace offerings—shared by the laity. Of necessity, when there was a consummating feast, the entire gift was not burnt; part was consumed by fire in symbolical gift to God, and part was retained. That this remnant commonly fell to the priesthood points to the significance of this closing act. The priests were the representatives of Jehovah; consumption by the priest was as much giving to God as consumption on the altar. There was a mystical union between Jehovah and his priests, and participation by the latter was participation by the former. In the peace offering there was a continuation of the same idea. For a time, the sacrificing family was admitted to the privileges of the priesthood. It consisted for a gracious season of priests unto God. As Kurtz has strikingly said, "Just as the effusion of blood betokened justification, . . . so the sacrificial meal told its tale of the *unio mystica*."

3. *The significance of the several species of sacrifice.* It will be convenient to reverse our previous order of exposition, and begin with—

*The bloodless offerings.* In these, as their name *minchoth* implies, the fact of presentation is alone emphasized. They were gifts to God simply; they were not a means of atonement. The whole ritual of their offering was adapted to express that they were presentations alone. Their further significance varied with their material. They consisted always of the products of labour; they were therefore objective representations of so much self-sacrifice; and it is interesting to see how these pure gifts might be made from all the branches of human activity—agriculture, stock-farming, arboriculture, merchandise, luxuries, even the spoils of battle and the titles of property.

*The several blood sacrifices.* These conveyed both the leading elements of Jewish worship. They were at once gifts and means of atonement. The ritual enjoined accentuated both features of blood manipulation and presentation. Further, whilst every blood sacrifice made both the aspects of sacrifice prominent, the materials ordered and the ritual enjoined adapted these fundamental facts to varying states of mind and inclination. The burnt offerings, and sin offerings, and trespass offerings, and peace offerings, were all means of adoring God, and covering sin as well; but in each species there was a special adaptation to the more vivid expression and satisfaction of some religious state.

The *burnt offering* is most nearly allied to the bloodless sacrifices. As its ritual shows most clearly, and as its name of *holocaust* implies, presentation is its leading characteristic; so far from the blood manipulation constituting a prominent feature, it seems to be, what it is in fact, a mere means to an end, a recognition of sinfulness lest the gift of man be despised. The variation too in the victims allowed points to the same fact—to the relative value of gifts, and is a kind of Old Testament proclamation of the duty of proportionate giving; the poor man's handful of meal, or pigeon, tells the same story as the widow's mite. On the other hand, the swinging of the blood collected by the priest against the altar is the least emphatic manner of procedure in atonement, whereas the burning of the whole carcase pointed most conclusively to the animal as a presentation to God.

In the *sin offering*, on the contrary, it is just the blood manipulation which is strongly emphasized. If the burnt offering was an atonement that it might be a gift, the sin offering was a gift that it might be an atonement. This inference is suggested by the name as well as the ritual. A sin offering was an offering for sin—for sin of an accurately defined nature, *sin bishgagah*, sin of error, and not deliberate sin. As for the ritual, there is as distinct an accentuation of the blood manipulation as there is an evident withdrawal into the background of the ritual of gift, the carcase simply falling to the priest, or being unstentatiously burnt without the camp, as a thing which has performed its purpose elsewhere. Further, in connection with the ritual of the making a substitute for sin, it is important to notice the increase in the value of the substitute as the status of the offerer rose. There is a well-marked gradation in the victims commanded, from the comparatively worthless she-goat of the common Israelite to the more valuable he-goat of the ruler, and thence to the ox for the priest or the congregation. Again, be it observed that the sin offerings of individuals were not presentable for any sin, but only for the so-called sins of ignorance, error, weakness, whichever word may be most suitably employed for the frequent lapses of sanctified but depraved human nature. Sharply defined, therefore, sin offerings were gifts which were made for atonement of sins of ignorance, sins of ignorance, according to the Levitical conception, being any sins which did not wilfully contravene the dictates of Jehovah.

Similarly, the significance of the *trespass offerings* may be inferred from the ritual and the law of their presentation. From the former it is manifest that neither the

element of gift nor of atonement was the prominent feature, but the element of restitution. In this class of sacrifice there was always an accompanying recompense, which was paid both to God who has been offended by the trespass, and to man who has been defrauded. It was the fancy value which was put upon the ram and which expiated the wrong-doer before the Great Giver of all things, and it was the monetary indemnity which expiated the human fraud, which gave to this offering its peculiar place and value. And this inference is strengthened by noting certain special cases in which this form of offering was ordained. Trespass offerings were to be made upon unconscious negligence in such dues as tithes or firstfruits, upon an unintentional infringement of a Divine command, and upon any deceitful violation of the rights of property ; thus, to translate the injunctions into more general terms, trespass offerings were to be made upon any forgetfulness of duty to God or duty to our neighbour. There was always present in this class of sacrifices the idea of retribution.

Similarly, in the *peace offerings*, it is again manifest that it is neither the fact of gift nor that of atonement which is uppermost, but that of the sacrificial meal. In this class, as in the preceding, the elements of presentation and atonement are but means to an end. The peace offerings were gifts and expiations that they might be feasts. The peace offering was the social offering, the sacrifice of friendship, where a man and his kindred might have loving fellowship with Jehovah and his priests. The burnt offering was the act of one in *union* with Jehovah, the peace offering of one who would cement *union* by *communion*. The peace offering was the Lord's Supper of the old covenant.

4. *The significance of the several feasts and fasts.* The several feasts and fasts now call for consideration before we proceed to build up these numerous details into one consistent and instructive synthesis. The significance of these festal or penitential seasons must again be inferred from the scriptural records by means of a careful induction in each case.

The general import of these exceptional times and seasons in the Jewish calendar may be gathered from the name so frequently applied to them. They are called "holy convocations ;" whereby is signified that they were not simply seasons of rest, a kind of *Décadi*, or *Sansculottide*, an atheistic day of rest, or popular festival ; they were holy days as well as holidays. Nor were they, this name implies, like birth and marriage days, like Waterloo memorials and American Days of Independence, like Foundation Days and remembrances of a pious benefactor—mere jubilant or regretful reminiscences of past events, such as the Divine pause after Creation, or the flight from Egypt, or the tenting-out at Succoth ; they were religious in the sense of present participation in spiritual privilege ; they were sacramental memorials. In short, the Jewish festivals (to use a convenient term not to be understood as excluding days of humiliation), whatever else they were, whether holidays or days of rest, were dedicated to religious exercises, and therefore became media for new experimental participation in the blessings of religious truth.

The *sabbaths* were times of holy convocation, and nothing more. They were pauses authoritatively demanded in the busy life of the world for spiritual as well as physical ends. They stood out amidst the days of the week as the Lord's days, and as peremptorily as the fourth commandment bade "Remember the sabbath day to keep it holy," did prophets take up the strain, saying, "Moreover, I gave them my sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that it is I the Lord that sanctify them." Of the same general sabbatic character the new moons partook, and the sabbatic and jubilee year also. They were times for holiness and congregation in addition to being seasons of rest. Without calling any special historical event to

mind, they were "holy convocations," labour being remitted that religion might be the more engrossing.

The remaining festal times and seasons had an additional characteristic. Besides being "holy convocations," when there might be a general adoration of Jehovah, and a general remembrance of his goodness, and a general participation in the blessedness which the truths he had graciously revealed were calculated to impart, there was in these other feasts and fasts a particular remembrance of some special religious crisis in the national history, a particular celebration of some special act of Divine goodness, and a particular reception of some special Divine blessing. It was as though each year there was again a remembrance of the principal needs of the religious life, together with the special Divine methods for ministering to those needs. In fact, as the sabbatic cycle of festivals was fitted to keep alive in the soul the general relations of the Jew to his covenant God, so the remaining festivals were individually adapted to fan the flickering embers of some single spiritual sense only too liable to expire. The several exceptional festivals were ordained to be at once holy convocations, sacred memorials, and blessed sacraments, and both history and precept are inadequately estimated if either element is disregarded.

Thus it is an insufficient interpretation of the *Passover* if it is spoken of simply as a remembrance of the first constitution of the released Hebrews. The *Passover*, as it was celebrated from year to year, was a re-enactment, a reiteration, a renewal of that ancient rite which inaugurated the Divine adoption of Israel as "a peculiar treasure, a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation," as Jehovah himself described the liberated Egyptian slaves. *Passover* was a time of solemn convocation and sacred reminiscence; it was also a repetition of that symbolic ritual by which the children of Israel were admitted into their peculiar relationship to the Deity, wherein they may feast as the ransomed sons of God. Briefly, *Passover* was a holy convocation, when the first *Passover* was recapitulated, and the nation again entered upon the amenities of Divine forgiveness and adoption. Or, yet more briefly, *Passover* was the Feast of Justification, "made year by year continually."

*The days succeeding the Passover* constitute one long festal season, commencing with the days of Unleavened Bread, and ending with the Feast of Firstfruits. Again we have an addition to the general significance of a festival for a special end. The justified nation is now submitting itself to rules of abstinence and habits of self-sacrifice. A not unsuitable name for this season would be the Feast of Consecration; or, to modify our previous form of speech, the Feast of Weeks, by which name the Old Testament seems sometimes to designate the whole period from *Passover* to *Pentecost*, was marked by special days of holy convocation, in which the first joys of national obedience and deliverance were reiterated, and the people admitted to the privileges of the Divine adoption testified to its blessedness by willing consecration of self and substance to Divine purposes. More briefly, the Feast of Weeks was the Feast of Consecration, "made year by year continually."

A similar line of remark is applicable to the great *Day of Atonement*. This day of humiliation was by no means a repetition of the *Passover*, as some have thought. It does not celebrate the entrance of the people upon covenant rights, nor the beneficial remembrance of that entrance; it is a fast and a penitential season for those who have been already admitted to the Divine intimacy. What else, then, could the *Day of Atonement* signify than the atonement demanded by the sinfulness inseparable even from the reconciled? What else could the *Day of Atonement* suggest than the permanent need of atonement even by a nation of priests? And what else did that day proclaim than the means divinely prearranged for meeting that evident need? The *Day of Atonement*

was, as its name implies, that holy convocation in which the covenant people were cleansed from the sin contaminating their holiest service, "year by year continually," —the Fast of Absolution.

Hence follows the meaning of that festival which formed the climax of the festive seasons of the year, the Feast of Tabernacles. Naturally enough it was jubilant and exultant; dances and singing and mirth were its natural accompaniments. For a time, at least, there was a joyous sojourn in the courts of the Lord's house, and a kind of Paradise restored where man might hear the voice of God amidst the leaves of the trees in which the swallow had built a nest for herself. The season was a symbolic representation of the joy of the elect, who dwell in Jehovah's temple fearlessly and gleefully. The Feast of Tabernacles, religiously regarded, was the Feast of the Joy of the Reconciled.

Such, at any rate, were the religious truths these festivals were fitted to convey, and the types of religious life they were adapted to gratify, mould, and objectify. Doubtless the picture drawn is ideal, as has been the whole delineation of the significance of the Levitical sacrifices. Undoubtedly also the realization was but rarely attained, and that not in the entire nation, but in the sanctified heart of some solitary worshipper like David or Ezekiel. Nevertheless, these Divine object-lessons were not without their value. They were at once an exercise and an embodiment of an indispensable form of educational religion. They were admirably qualified for a paternal education of a religious childhood, if they fell short of a personal culture of a religious manhood. Add the further truth, so clearly taught in the old covenant, of the preparatory character of Judaism, and this divinely given cultus by presentation and atonement was blessed and stimulating indeed, "a schoolmaster to bring us to Christ."

#### C. THE APPLICATION OF THE PRINCIPLES DEDUCED TO THE ENTIRE SCHEME OF THE LEVITICAL SACRIFICES.

There is, alas! no royal road to the comprehension of the Levitical sacrifices, and in the esteem of the present writer it is only after a laborious, observant, protracted, and possibly wearisome journey through a wide realm of detail, that anything like sure approach can be made to a mastery of the difficulties of the way. A few jottings only of that journey have been given, a few impressions recorded in transit, but even now some advance can be made to the promised land of intelligibility. To speak without figure, a complete synthesis of the facts and interpretations already obtained could only result upon a full and exhaustive survey by the light of the principles deduced of the entire Jewish calendar of sacrifice. Such a survey is precluded by our limits; but some suggestive outlines thereof may now be drawn.

Let us suppose ourselves standing within the entrance of the court of the tabernacle or the temple as twilight is passing into dawn on the morning of the 1st of Abib, or, as it was afterwards called, the 1st of Nisan. For years the same round of ritual has been pursued, at once reminding the chosen people of their exceptional religious privileges and expressing with eloquent symbol the religious sentiments which so benevolent a religious system could evoke and educate, and once more the blank page of the new year is being presented for completion, and the services of the year are recommencing. Before our eyes the barefooted priests, who are to officiate in their course, are already preparing themselves for their solemn duties by ablution at the brazen laver, whilst, on the hearth of the altar of burnt offerings the remnants of the first evening sacrifice of the new year are still burning. The ceremonies of the day begin. First comes the continuous burnt offering. One of the elders of the people possibly presents himself in the people's name at the altar, bringing with him the appointed lamb for the sacrifice and

the appointed meat and drink offerings. He is seen to lay his hand with some force upon the victim's head, thus dedicating it in the name of the entire people as a burnt offering in its behalf. He draws his knife and cuts its throat. The priest, who is ready with a basin, collects the streaming blood and dashes it as an atonement against the sides of the altar, then dissects and cleanses the carcase in the prescribed manner, and, laying the pieces in order upon the hearth, the morning oblation rises into the air, "a sweet savour unto Jehovah;" and once more the daily burnt sacrifice has been presented as an acceptable token and memorial of the nation's consecration to Jehovah.

But the day is a new moon, a more emphatic and memorable day of grace, and a more elaborate offering is added to the ordinary daily presentation. The task of the national representative, whoever he may be, is not yet complete, and he again presents himself in the same place with two young bullocks, a ram, and seven lambs for a burnt offering, together with the prescribed offerings of meat and wine, and also with a kid for a sin offering. Analogy would suggest that the sin offering is first made. Again the offering is formally made to the priests at the brazen altar, clad as before in their white robes and parti-coloured girdles, but increased in number; again the hand is impressed upon the head of the victim; again the animal is slain in the nation's behalf; again one of the priests, the accredited representatives of Jehovah, collects the blood of the slaughtered beast; but there the similarity of the ceremonial ends. According to the ritual ordained for the sin offering, some of the blood is more carefully smeared upon the horns of the altar, and is thus brought in more solemn memorial before the Lord, whilst the remainder is poured away, its end being achieved, at the base of the altar; some few portions of the fat are alone consumed by fire, the offering partaking more of the nature of an atonement than a gift, and for the same reason the rest of the carcase is not burnt within the sacred precincts of the holy place, but in some clean spot without the camp. Then follows the large monthly burnt offering before described, which puts the larger number of priests in requisition, the same form of ritual being gone through as in the case of the "continuous" sacrifice, and the same truth being signified with more display. Thus, at the opening year, the chosen nation is again reminded of its consecration, and reconsecrated to God in emphatic manner, the doctrine being simultaneously declared by the presentation of the sin offering as well as by the form of blood sacrifice, that even the best hours of religious acknowledgment in the most prominent days of a sanctified people are not untainted by sin, but call for humiliation and atonement.

The national offerings made, and the golden candlestick replenished in the holy place, the official offerings follow. The high priest, in his official robes of white and blue, "Holiness to the Lord" glistening in gold upon his mitre, his jewelled breastplate flashing and sparkling in the early sun, passes to the performance of his exalted functions, the bells and pomegranates at the fringe of his broidered tunic ringing as he goes to present his daily sacrifice. Now he burns his offering of meal at the altar of burnt offering, and, by a gift of his substance, consecrates himself anew to the Lord, no effusion of blood being in his case necessary, because of the peculiar holiness supposed to attach to his sublime office; now he advances to the holy place, and, drawing back the chequered curtain, "a thing of beauty and of glory," is hidden from view for a time, but within, we know, he is burning incense before the Lord on the golden altar, as a further testimony of priestly consecration—presenting solemnly this exceptional holocaust without blood.

The personal offerings now succeed. These, of course, vary from day to day according to the number of those who are religiously impressed with the necessity of sacrifice, and according to the mode of impression. For, legally compulsory as several of the varieties

of individual sacrifices were, there was an element of freedom in some, and of limitation in all; and as manifestly as the burnt offerings and peace offerings were purely voluntary, it is equally evident that the sin offerings and trespass offerings were largely influenced by time and space. A Jew who lived remote from Jerusalem, for example, might know the Law, but could not possibly fulfil it; thus there would be, even with the enthusiastically religious, a more probable remembrance and observance upon certain set occasions, such as the annual feasts. Nor must the hardness of the human heart be forgotten, and the rare virtue of living up to spiritual privileges. Still, the supposition is that we are standing in the court of the tabernacle on a New Year's Day. Although not dignified with the importance of Pentecost or the great Day of Atonement, it is still a festal day, and offerings of many kinds will certainly be presented. At one hour, full of gratitude to God, and anxious for service and self-abnegation, a man brings his bull, or his ram, or his goat, for a burnt offering, according to his means and inclination, whilst his poorer neighbour presents his pair of pigeons. The customary ritual is gone through, each stage of which is symbolically expressive of the act and method of consecration, until the holocaust rises "as an offering of fire of a sweet savour unto Jehovah," and the deed of personal consecration is complete. At another time it is an omission of some sacred duty which is to be remembered before the Lord, and in that obedience which is dearer even than sacrifice, an Israelite from the ranks is leading his spotless shaggy she-goat to the altar, when again the ceremonies of presentation, of imposition, and of slaughter are carefully gone through, each stage in the sanguinary proceeding having its own spiritual suggestiveness for the religiously minded, the blood is smeared upon the horns of the altar to bring the medium of atonement before the Lord, and, the expiation for the unwitting sin being ended, the offerer walks away, mentally at rest. Or perhaps it is a trespass offering which is being brought in repentant recollection of some deed of fraud, a kind of conscience money; in acknowledgment of wrong done to God as well as man, the substitutionary ram is presented and slain, whilst the story of the fraud is told over the head of the slaughtered beast, the priest placing a judicial value upon the wrong done to Jehovah, and accepting the ram in lieu thereof, a monetary recompense being made to the injured neighbour. Or it may be a peace offering which is brought by a whole family in joyful recognition of the Divine goodness, the priest being welcomed to the hallowed society; the victim is slain, and the sin present even in such united religious joy atoned; and the feast follows within the sacred precincts of the holy place—a love feast indeed, a banquet where "the banner over them was love." Or, descending to the less frequent instances of the Levitical ceremonial, "now a Hebrew woman, but recently a mother, is modestly presenting herself with her offering of pigeons; and now the high priest is passing through the gate of the court, attended by a Levite carrying birds and scarlet wool and hyssop—he has been summoned without the camp to examine a restored leper. Anon an application is made for the means of purifying some tent where the dead is lying. At one hour a householder is compounding for the property which he has voluntarily vowed unto the Lord; the next, a Nazarite, with unshorn hair and beard is presenting the prescribed sacrifices for release from his vow."

Such might have been the sights afforded to the observer by a single day. From early morning to the hour of the evening sacrifice there was oftentimes, we may assume, one long series of presentations by all grades of people and for all varieties of experience; and a similar course was pursued the whole year round, as we shall presently detail at more length after a brief digression which is rather a further explanation.

To test the usefulness and the sufficiency of the explanatory principles already deduced, let attention be concentrated upon two of those peculiar ceremonies which

might be occasionally witnessed, namely, that of the purification of the dead and that of the consecration to the priesthood.

Analyze, for example, the rites ordained for the purification of the dead—interpret them by the light of the principles previously deduced—and the ceremony would suggest some such series of thoughts as the following. The rite was a purification, and as such pointed to the great doctrine of original sin. It was a purification of an exceptionally solemn kind, and it was a purification of a solemn kind from its singular blending of the atoning with the cleansing element of the Levitical worship. Such is an induction from the various features in which the ritual resembled, and differed from, the general course of procedure. According to the Law, a dead body contaminated all in its vicinity. “To be in a tent at the time of the death of an inmate, to enter a tent where a dead body lay, to touch a corpse, a grave, or a bone, was to contract uncleanness for seven days.” The process of purification was very arresting, from its peculiarity. Like most processes of purification, it was a form of aqueous ablution; but the water employed had been specifically prepared. A red cow was brought to the son or heir of the high priest, by the popular representatives, for slaughter without the camp. Very little ceremonial was observed, but all was singularly expressive. The blood was sprinkled seven times towards the tabernacle, and then the whole of the carcase—not a part—together with the skin and the blood and dung, was burnt; a little cedar-wood, hyssop, and scarlet wool being thrown into the fire. From the ashes the water of purification was prepared. When occasion called, the ashes were mixed with spring water, and sprinkled, by means of a bunch of hyssop, on the third and seventh day after defilement, upon the tent and the vessels and persons it contained; after the customary ablution of the person, the unclean became pure in the evening. After ablution also, all those who had had any share in the ritual, and who were thus rendered unclean, were also purified. Now, the use of water associates this curious rite with the other rites of purification, and therefore shows that, according to the Levitical conception, contamination by the proximity of death was regarded as a form of involuntary sin, which, like parturition, proclaimed the natural depravity of man, to be obviated by special ceremonial. But the peculiarities of ritual imparted a specific character to this form of purification. Not simply was water to be used, but running or spring water—water at its greatest power of cleansing; *living* water, as the Hebrew expressively puts it. Further, this “water of iniquity” was a lye prepared by the admixture of these ashes of the red cow. What additional significance is thereby given? These ashes were loudly eloquent of atonement, and nothing but atonement. Let it be noted that this red cow was manifestly a kind of sin offering—indeed, it is actually so called: did not the blood manipulation point to the same conclusion?—but that it differs in many essential points from the sin offering proper. Like the latter, it was a national propitiation, and was therefore brought by the representatives of the tribes; but, unlike the latter, it consisted of a cow—most probably that it be not confounded with the bullock enjoined for the sin offering for the congregation, and that at the same time its inferior grade be denoted. Then let it also be observed that this cow was in no sense a presentation, like the sin offering proper. It was not offered at the altar of burnt offering, but without the camp; no portions were reserved for priestly use. It was not submitted to the customary rites of presentation; even the skin and faeces were burnt, and not separated. In fact, this red cow was an atonement by substitution—this, and nothing more. Its blood was sprinkled, like the blood of the sin offering, before the tabernacle seven times, thus bringing the appointed means of “covering” emphatically before Jehovah; scarlet wool—blood-coloured wool—was thrown into the flames when the carcase was burnt; nay, the very colour of

---

the cow was selected as the colour of the blood which atoned; and so completely was the victim regarded as a substitute, that every ministrant at the ritual was rendered unclean thereby, and the high priest was precluded from officiating, lest he be incapacitated for his other exalted functions, and so his son, his nearest kinsman, and official representative took his place. Thus, in pictorial and impressive form, the momentous truths were inculcated of death as the punishment of sin ordained by the Divine anger, and of the counteraction of the influence of death by an appointed substitute. There is not a detail of the involved ritual which cannot be explained by the aid of such principles as we have deduced.

So, too, so elaborate a ceremonial as the consecration of a priest becomes at once lucid, brilliant, suggestive, and religious by the application of the principles in question. As we have seen, a bullock and two rams, unleavened bread and wheaten cakes, were brought to the door of the tabernacle, where the candidates to be initiated were washed with water, arrayed in official garments, anointed with the holy oil, atoned for by a sin offering, sanctified by a burnt offering, and admitted to fellowship by a peace offering. In one significant particular the ritual of this closing sacrifice differed from that customarily observed in sacrifices of the same class. After the habitual imposition of the hand, and slaughter, some of the collected blood was put upon the tip of the right ear, the thumb of the right hand, and the toe of the right foot, and was sprinkled upon the clothing of the newly ordained priest, in addition to the usual smearing of the horns of the altar. Now, as most investigators have pointed out, this consecration consisted of two sets of three acts. In the first place, there was a solemn purification, an express investiture, and a formal anointing; and in the second place, there followed a triple sacrifice in the noteworthy order of a sin offering, a burnt offering, and a peace offering. Every detail is luminous and has of itself a profound suggestiveness for the age contemporaneous, and although the minutiae of the rite only receive their full illumination in Christianity, they nevertheless conveyed many a valuable lesson to the Jew. In fact, in its adaptation of the general ritual of Levitical sacrifice to the ordination of priests, the prescribed ceremonial is a simple and intelligible object-lesson in the requisites of acceptable religious service. In the set washing with water we have, as Oehler put it, "a symbol of the spiritual purification without which none can approach God, at least to atone." In the investiture there is the visible assumption of the priestly office. In the anointing, the Divine seal is attached to such acceptance of office; whereas the sin inherent even in an accepted priest must be removed by a sin offering, upon which may follow the expressive sacrifices of consecration and fellowship. As for the varying features in the peace offering, where a different blood manipulation is gone through, what change could be more significant? Before admission to the communion of priests, and of the Deity whom the priests serve, there must be a specific atonement, and the atoning blood of the ram, "the ram of consecration," is placed not only in contact with the altar, but with the person and garments of the newly ordained priest, the very ceremonial signifying that the ear and hand and foot, which are to be swift to serve, must be atoned for before they are hallowed, and that the very garments of office must be cleansed before dedication to their sacred use.

With such daily observances, the Jewish year ran its course, the customary worship repeated evening and morning, in combination with the voluntary expression of religion by sacrifice, associating absolution, confession, and adoration with all the phases and grades of the national life. If the tribe of Levi sanctified itself by holy service in sacrifice, by the same means the farmer sanctified his toil, the mother her child, the father his skill, the prophet his calling, the singer his talent, the prince his government, and the elders their nation. Day by day these Levitical sacrifices were

capable of proclaiming, in sanctuary, in palace, in market, in house, and in tent, religious truths of the highest importance. To this daily observance let the additional observances of the various festal seasons be added, and it will become yet more manifest how admirably this cultus of sacrifice at once educated and ministered to the Jewish phasis of religion.

From the 2nd of Abib to the 10th, the customary daily celebration of Divine service was observed, the interval being abnormally broken into solely by the increased consecration called for and symbolized by the double burnt offering of the sabbath. Wher God was especially remembered, man was to be especially consecrated. With the 10th of Abib came the Paschal feast, continued more or less till the Feast of Pentecost. And very full of spiritual suggestions was this opening festival of the year, every detail of the rites enjoined tending to deepen those suggestions. In its first institution, as we have seen, the Passover was a sacrificial admission to covenant rights, and every subsequent celebration thereof was at once a remembrance and a repetition of that initiatory ceremonial. From this fundamental significance all the peculiarities of this sacrifice follow. Thus the Paschal lamb was neither a sin offering pure and simple nor a peace offering; it did not in many important points come beneath the laws of the acknowledged sacrificial ritual. It was a kind of inclusive sacrifice, which conveyed the prominent teaching of several forms of sacrifice under one suggestive form. Thus first and foremost the Paschal lamb was an atonement of so potent a nature as to arrest the destroying arm of the angel of death, and of so emphatic a ritual as to be brought more into contact with the several households of the tribes than was the case in any other festal season. The time allowed to elapse between the selection of the victim and its slaughter, the minute injunctions for the sprinkling of the blood upon the lintel and doorposts, the command that no bone of the lamb was to be broken, the strict command that what remained was to be burnt by fire, the rapid manner of partaking,—all pointed to the offering as less intended for a feast than an atonement, and laid very exceptional stress upon the neutralizing power of the effused blood. Certain features of the feast were undoubtedly ordained because of the peculiar position of the Israelites in Egypt, and if that position be borne in mind, and the fundamental significance of the Passover as the great initiatory rite, all the superficial difficulties of the narrative are removed. It is, of course, not denied, but strongly believed, that there are features in this institution which nothing but the fulfilment of the type could perfectly explain, and which are the outcome of distinct Divine prevision; at the same time, it is contended that even so extraordinary a command as that of keeping the skeleton intact was intelligible to the Jew as a natural consequence of what he was able to apprehend of the meaning of the Passover. Possibly even this nineteenth century is a record of many facts likewise which seem to us to be of a present import only, which will only receive an adequate explanation in the light of a coming dispensation. Similarly with the following days of the Paschal feast and with the day of Pentecost, all the details of the injunctions relative thereto are nothing but exemplifications divinely prearranged of the leading fact taught thereby of the Feast of Consecration. Therefore, for example, was the pleasure of leavened bread eschewed; therefore were the firstfruits presented.

Nor need we go outside the principles already deduced for explanation of the remaining feasts and their observances. Pentecost past, the year rolled upon its course for a time, it is true, in a more level manner, the regularity of the daily celebration being only interrupted by the sabbatic and lunar formalities, every day, therefore, a kind of gospel being proclaimed of Divine mercy and forgiveness and reconciliation, with its invariable postulates of human sin and decadence, death and guilt. At length came

the high season of the seventh month, heralded by the rousing blasts of the Feast of Trumpets.

The seventh month affords two very excellent tests of the adequacy of these principles of interpretation, namely, in their application to the elucidation of the great Day of Atonement and the Feast of Tabernacles. The ritual of the former need not be repeated; it was undoubtedly exceptional; it was as undoubtedly instructive; indeed, the more minute and accurate the investigation bestowed even upon the more trivial points of observance, the more harmonious does it appear, and the more didactic. At first sight, it may be allowed, the ceremonial shows a laboured and officialistic respect to a mass of legal detail, valuable as a testimony to ecclesiastical thoroughness in routine, and to little else. Viewed more closely, the ceremonial is a complete and balanced whole, exact and even concise, forcible as well as clear in the religious lesson it has to convey. That lesson, as we have seen, is the atonement possible for the sins of the redeemed, for, be it observed, the stranger and the foreigner had no part in the worship of this day of national humiliation. Carrying this principle in the mind, the entire series of acts yields up its meaning. Not a soul in the priestly tribe, however holy and exalted his function, not a utensil in the consecrated place, however sacred and sublime its use, but must be atoned for. Hence the mediators and the instruments of mediation must be first removed from beneath the ban of uncleanness and sin. The solemn proceedings are therefore commenced by the offering of the bullock in expiation of the holy places and ministrants. The high priest, who leads in officiating, may not even wear his official robes till the ceremonial of expiation is completed, but stands at the altar clothed in white; and, on the slaughter of the bullock, sprinkles the mercy-seat and the floors and the altars with the blood of atonement, and presents the blood before the Lord in atonement for his own sin and the sins of his kindred and tribe. The whole ritual is an emphatic act of atonement, as every detail shows. Atonement is likewise solemnly made by the blood of the ram in behalf of the nation. The remaining rite was an exquisitely symbolic act, declarative of forgiveness. Confessing over the head of the live goat the sins and iniquities of the entire nation, the high priest seemed to transfer those sins to the head of the animal, who bore them away from the dwelling-place of Jehovah, and carried them into the abode of Azazel. The sins were removed as well as covered. Now the priest may assume his golden garments; now the people may present acceptable sacrifice; now burnt offerings may typify the national consecration.

The ritual of the Feast of Tabernacles is somewhat less intelligible; nevertheless, its secret was also largely open to the thoughtful and devout Jew. It very expressively followed the more serious service of the Day of Atonement, and gave visible and pleasant expression to the joy of the elect, who have been redeemed at the Passover, consecrated at Pentecost, and absolved at the great day of national expiation. This feast ended, the climax of the doctrinal teaching by symbol had been reached, and the year was brought to a close by the common series of daily, weekly, and monthly sacrifices.

Now, in view of this didactic sacrificial cultus, at once so eloquent and so disciplinary, it would certainly be interesting to inquire what contributions were thereby made towards a system of revealed religion. It would also be interesting to ask with what arguments the pious Jew would combat the assaults of disbelievers in what he regarded the Divine origin of his sacrificial creed. Nor could it be by any means impracticable, whilst it certainly would be of value, to frame both a systematic and apologetic theology of Judaism, in which such notes as the laws of purification and the injunctions for blood sacrifice, the significance of the priesthood and the explanation expressly assigned to the tabernacle, might, by an intellectual effort of no severe kind, be made to disclose the inmost messages of their symbolists, and become part of a concatenated

doctrine of Old Testament theology, of its doctrine of sin and of salvation, of its doctrine of God and of man. But after all, it is the practical aspect of this Old Testament faith which most calls for admiring regard. Its theological implications are of interest to the theologian, its practical implications are of human interest. And practically regarded, these Levitical sacrifices are noteworthy, first, as a means of religious education, and next as a means of religious satisfaction. They evolved religious sentiment, and they appeased it. However superficially this sacrificial cultus be regarded, it assuredly proclaimed such truths as these: the sinfulness of man (extending too beyond the bounds of volition, and affecting the race), the Divine alienation consequent thereupon, the need of atonement, its possibility, its method, the acceptability of the service of the reconciled. All these truths—which, to judge from Christianity, constitute the essentials of a religion adapted to man—were taught by arresting symbolism and an imposing ceremonial. They were equally capable of educating up to a high degree of religiousness and of ministering to the religious needs so matured. They affected too the whole range of life, training the Church, sanctifying the State, penetrating the home, and affecting the individual. They interwove the essentials of religion with all the relationships, duties, sorrows, and pleasures of life. According to its own ideal, the Jewish nation was a theocracy where reconciled rebels gave their every allegiance to the King of kings acceptably.

Thus, historically regarded, and without trespassing upon or forestalling the later revelations made by Christ and his apostles, the Levitical sacrifices are seen to be a profound recognition of the wants of man, and a response to his deepest needs. The Levitical sacrifices declared unmistakably, from the hour of their first promulgation, the necessity there was for atonement, and the Divine provision for that necessity. Indeed, it is simple truth to say that there is not a feature of the Levitical sacrifices which does not accentuate in some way, either the fact of estrangement from God with its large disabilities, or the fact of reconciliation to God with its large privileges. To how enormous an extent their teaching relied for confirmation and potency upon Christianity, we shall presently see; just now the point upon which it is necessary to insist is the value of Judaism as a religious system apart from Christianity. The system was, alas! ideal. The Jew seldom realized and never exhausted its magnificent possibilities. Nevertheless, how immense was its practical value, let the hundred and nineteenth psalm testify, with its hundred and seventy-six verses in praise of this very Levitical system, which the Psalmist is glad to recall, and which he feels it no exaggeration to describe—mass of commandments, laws, testimonies, statutes, though it be—as a fitting guide of youth, an object of great delight, a mine of wonders; as the rule of the free and the song of the exile; as sweeter than honey and more valuable than riches; as life, light, and health; a pleasant subject of meditation in this world and also in the eternity of Jehovah.

#### D. RELATION OF THE LEVITICAL SACRIFICES TO THE SACRIFICES OF THE PATRIARCHAL AGE.

Contrasting this detailed and expressive system of Levitical sacrifice with the brief records of the pre-Mosaic age, it would appear that the later cultus differed from the earlier in *authority*, in *complexity*, in *centralization*, in *doctrine*, and in *practical value*.

As regards the *authority* of the Levitical sacrifices, they are expressly ascribed to a Divine origin. "And Jehovah said unto Moses" is the almost invariable formula with which the several legal sections begin. In this there is a marked distinction from

the days of the great fathers of the Hebrew nation. Whatever Divine influences were brought to bear upon Abel in the first recorded sacrifice—and it is easy to exaggerate those influences to the detriment of the inspiriting teaching of the narrative—it is manifest that from that time onwards the ever-growing system of worship by sacrifice was almost wholly a human development. "Almost wholly," we say, for sacrificial revelations were given to Noah and Abraham, but the one was simply an exhortation to sacrifice, and the other a correction of an erroneous inference. In fact, the patriarchal sacrifices are apparently representative of pure ethnic sacrifices, whereas the Divine acknowledgment and improvement of human religious ideas testify at once to the hardness of the human heart and to the gracious condescension of Jehovah.

So it is likewise evident that the Levitical sacrifices were an advance upon the patriarchal in *complexity*. Hereditary priests have taken the place of the father of the family, and all the various ceremonial of the court, the holy place, and the holiest, in all the mutations of the Jewish year, have superseded those two simple varieties mentioned in earlier times, the burnt offering and the festal offering—which were adapted on occasion, as best they could be, to all the changing and contrasted emotion of the religious life.

A third difference between the two dispensations is seen in the later *localization*. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, wherever God had revealed himself and made his presence known, could present their offerings of praise, and erect their holy places. The Levitical sacrifices are legitimate, so testifies the whole Pentateuch, at one sanctuary alone. There being a localization of Deity, or rather of his gracious presence, acceptable sacrifice must be offered in the neighbourhood of the mercy-seat.

There is a clearness too in the *doctrinal* implications of the Levitical rites, which is conspicuously absent from the earlier forms of worship. No such array of parallel principles can be inferred from the Genesis as has been deduced from the Exodus and the Leviticus. The acceptability of sacrifice, as a testimony to self-sacrifice even, has very much less evident sanction for Abraham than for Moses. The point is so certain that attention needs simply be drawn thereto. To an additional point, however, it is necessary to refer with some distinctness; the patriarchal cultus was a worship *by presentation*, the Levitical cultus was a worship *by atonement* as well. No reference is made in the Genesis, whether direct or indirect, by express statement, by ritual, or by any mention of a special manipulation of the blood of the victims offered, to the Levitical doctrine of expiation by blood. Animal sacrifices were made, it is true, but only because stock-farming as well as agriculture formed part of the staple labour of the ancestors of the Jewish nations, and gifts might be therefore made from the former as well as the latter, or because animal food was eaten by them as well as vegetable. The evidence would seem to be conclusive that not only did the Almighty, according to the testimony of the Pentateuch, adopt the results of human religious thought and practice, giving them at the same time a wider bearing and a more assured interpretation, but that he added to that interpretation the very significant doctrine peculiar to Judaism of the atonement for sin by the blood of a substituted victim.

And of course all these differences culminated in a difference of *practice*. The educational value of the religion of Moses was higher than that of the pre-Mosaic age, because more accurate and minute in doctrinal significance, just as, for the same reason, its value was increased as a discipline. A more developed and sound theology is always the cause of a profounder and more useful religious education, and a purer and more satisfying religious worship.

## E. RELATION OF THE LEVITICAL SACRIFICES TO THE CHRISTIAN SACRIFICES.

The religions of Moses and Jesus Christ both agree and differ in their sacrificial teaching.

They agree in dividing their doctrine of sacrifice into two parts; their doctrine of presentation and their doctrine of atonement, according to both presentation being possible and atonement necessary. They also agree in asserting that atonement must precede sacrifice.

They differ in the material, directness, and timeliness of presentation, and in the method and frequency of atonement. To take the latter points first. The New Testament teaches that atonement is made for human sin by the substitution of the life of Jesus for that of the sinner. As Peter expresses it, "Christ, who his own self carried up our sins in his own body to the tree, that we, having died to sins, might live unto righteousness." Or, as Paul put it, adopting the Jewish synonym of blood for life, "Christ Jesus, . . . whom God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith, by his blood;" and according to the nature of the case this atonement or propitiation is made once for all. The Old Testament teaches that the Jew is atoned for by the blood, or life, of an animal substitute, which is so far from being presented once for all, that life must be effused on every occasion of worship. Similarly as regards the doctrine of presentation, there is a change of teaching: in the Old Testament, certain prescribed forms of offering are alone allowed, and the man is accepted because of the offering of his substance; in the New, self is more important, and the offering is accepted because of the man. There is an alteration in another respect: the New Testament demands no priestly mediation like that of the tribe of Levi in approaching the Majesty on high. And in yet a third respect there is a change: the offering of a reconciled heart may be made at any time and in any place at the free suggestion of the worshipper, and without legal restriction.

Without entering, therefore, upon abstract doctrinal discussion, and judging solely by the facts presented by the sacrificial conceptions of the two dispensations, they are manifestly connected, and that as the higher and the lower in a prearranged system of development. There is in Christianity an evident growth in reasonableness and freedom. In Christianity the fetters of Judaism are snapped, and its unintelligible features are explained. As Augustine said, "In the epoch of the old covenant the new lay latent, as a fruit does in a root," or, in the language of more modern times, we may say, the New Testament sacrifices are antitypes of those of the Old. In a word, judged by the definition of final cause, Christianity is the final cause of Judaism.

## F. THE LITERATURE OF THE LEVITICAL SACRIFICES.

From the voluminous literature upon the Levitical sacrifices the following treatises are selected as of especial importance:—

I. BIBLICAL DICTIONARIES AND CYCLOPÆDIAS. See the relative articles in Herzog, 'Realencyklopädie'; Riehm, 'Handwörterbuch des Biblischen Alterthums'; Smith, 'Dictionary of the Bible'; Winer, 'Biblisches Real-Wörterbuch.'

II. COMMENTARIES. Baumgarten, 'Theologischer Kommentar zum Pentateuch,' two vols., Kiel, 1843, 1844; Hirsch, 'Der Pentateuch Uebersetzt und Erklärt,' Frankfort, 1878, five vols. (valuable for its rabbinic lore); Joule, 'Notes on Leviticus,' London, 1879; Kalisch, 'Leviticus,' especially Essay A, London, 1867; Knobel, 'Exodus und Leviticus,' 1857 (a second edition, edited by Dillmann, which is almost a new work, was issued last year).

III. BIBLICAL ARCHAEOLOGY AND THEOLOGY. De Wette, 'Lehrbuch der Hebr-

Jüdischen Archäologie,' 4th edit., Leipzig, 1864; Ewald, 'Die Alterthümer des Volkes Israel,' 3rd edit., Göttingen, 1866 (English translation, 1876); 'Die Lehre der Bibel von Gott, oder Theologie des Alten und Neuen Bundes,' four vols., Leipzig, 1871—1875; Fairbairn, 'The Typology of Scripture,' two vols., 5th edit., 1870; Hofmann, 'Der Schriftbeweis,' 2nd edit., three vols., Nördlingen, 1857; Hoffmann, 'Abhandlungen über die Pentateuch-Gesetze,' Berlin, 1878 (valuable for its acquaintance with the synagogal literature); Jatho, 'Blicke in die Bedeutung des Mosaischen Cultus,' Hildesheim, 1876; Keil, 'Handbuch der Biblischen Archäologie,' 1st half, 1st edit., 1858, 2nd edit., 1875; Kliefoth, 'Liturgische Abhandlungen,' vol. iv., 2nd edit., 1858; Litton, 'The Mosaic Dispensation,' the Bampton Lecture for 1856; Lowman, 'Rationale of the Ritual of the Hebrew Worship,' London, 1748; Maurice, 'The Doctrine of Sacrifice,' new edit., London, 1879; Oehler, 'Theologie des Alten Testament,' vol. i., Tübingen, 1873 (translated into English, 1875); Saalschütz, 'Archäologie der Hebräer,' two vols., 1855, 1856; Salvador, 'Histoire des Institutions de Moïse et du Peuple Hébreu,' two vols., 3rd edit., Paris, 1862; Schäfer, 'Die Religiösen Alterthümer der Bibel,' Münster, 1878; Schultz, 'Alttestamentliche Theologie,' vol. i., Frankfurt, 1869 (2nd edit., adapting results to the hypothesis of Graf and Kuennen, 1878); Steudel, 'Vorlesungen über die Theologie des Alten Testaments,' Berlin, 1840; Spencer, 'De Legibus Hebræorum et eorum Rationibus,' 1st edit., 1865; Tholuck, 'Das Alte Testament im Neuen Testamente,' Gotha, 6th edit., 1868; Umbreit, 'Die Sünde, Beitrag zur Theologie des Alten Testaments,' Gotha, 1853.

IV. MONOGRAPHS ON THE LEVITICAL SACRIFICES. Bähr, 'Symbolik des Mosaischen Cultus,' in two vols., Heidelberg, 1837 (the first volume of a second and largely altered edition was issued at the close of 1875, but upon the doctrine of sacrifice all that has appeared is in the first edition); Hengstenberg, 'Die Opfer der Heiligen Schrift,' Berlin, 1859 (translated as an Appendix to his 'Commentary on Ecclesiastes,' in the Foreign Theological Library); Kurtz, 'Der Alttestamentliche Opfercultus,' Mittau, 1862 (translated in Foreign Theological Library); Outram, 'De Sacrificiis,' 1st edit., London, 1877 (translated into English, 1817); Stöckl, 'Liturgie und Dogmatische Bedeutung der Alttest. Opfer, Insbesondere in ihren Verhältnisse zur Neutest. Opfertheorie,' 1848; Wangemann, 'Das Opfer nach Lehre des Heiligen Schrift,' two vols., Berlin, 1866.

V. REVIEW ARTICLES ON THE LEVITICAL SACRIFICES. De Charenay, 'Fragments sur la Symbolique Hébraïque,' in the *Revue de Linguistique*, April, 1879; Listov, 'Was Bedeutet im Mos. Cultus das Versöhnung,' in the *Theological Tidskrift*, 1878; Mannheimer, 'Der Mosaismus im Gegensatz zum Egyptenthum,' *Jüdisches Literaturblatt*, 1878; Marbach, 'Das Blut, eine Theologische Studie,' in *Hilgenfeld's Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1866; Neumann, 'Die Opfer des Alten Bundes,' in the *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Christl. Wissenschaft*, 1852, 1853, and 1857; Park, 'The Divine Institution of Sacrifice,' in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, January, 1876; Riehm, 'Der Begriff der Sühne im Alten Testament,' in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1877.

VI. MONOGRAPHS ON RELATED THEMES. Auber, 'Histoire et Théorie du Symbolisme Régieuse,' four vols., Paris, 1872; Ebrard, 'Die Lehre von der Stellvertretenden Genugthuung in der Heiligen Schrift Begründet,' Königsberg, 1856; Klaiber, 'Die Neutest. Lehre von der Sünde und Erlösung,' Stuttgart, 1836; Küper, 'Das Priestertum des Alten Bundes,' Berlin, 1866.

VII. JEWISH AND TALMUDIC LITERATURE. The tractates 'Sebachim' and 'Menachoth,' Ugolino, 'Thesaurus Antiquitatum Sacrarum.' The writings of Philo, especially the 'De Victimis' and the 'De Victimis Offerentibus.' Numerous extracts in Buxtorf, 'Lexicon Chaldaicum et Talmudicum;' Godwyn, 'Moses and Aaron;' Carpzov, 'Apparatus Criticus;' the works of Lightfoot, especially his 'Temple Service in the Days of our Saviour;' and Reland, 'Antiquitates Sacrae.' The commentary upon Leviticus of Raschi, edited by Berliner, 1866, and Schlossberg's 'Sifra,' 1862.

For a brief statement and criticism of the several schools of interpretation, the reader is referred to the chapter upon the Theories of the Old Testament Sacrifices reviewed in my work on Sacrifice.



# THE BOOK OF LEVITICUS.

---

## INTRODUCTION.

### 1. SUBJECT OF THE BOOK.

LEVITICUS forms the centre and nucleus of the five books of Moses. Closely attached to it are the two Books of Exodus and Numbers, and outside of them, on either side, stand Genesis and Deuteronomy. The subject of the Book of Leviticus is the Sinaitic legislation, from the time that the tabernacle was erected. It does not, however, comprise the whole of that legislation. There is an overflow of it into the Book of Numbers, which thus contains the laws on the Levites and their service (Numb. i. 49—53; iii. 5—15, 40—48; iv. 1—33; viii. 5—26); on the order in which the tribes were to encamp (Numb. ii. 1—31); on the removal of the unclean from the camp (Numb. v. 2—4); on the trial of jealousy (Numb. v. 11—31); on the Nazarites (Numb. vi. 1—21); on the form of blessing the people (Numb. vi. 23—27); on the second month's Passover (Numb. ix. 6—12); on the silver trumpets (Numb. x. 1—10); besides a repetition of the laws on restitution (Numb. v. 6—10); on the lighting of the lamps (Numb. viii. 2—4); on the Passover (Numb. ix. 1—5). With these exceptions, the Book of Leviticus contains the whole of the legislation delivered in the district of Mount Sinai, during the month and twenty days which elapsed between the setting up of the tabernacle on the first day of the second year after quitting Egypt, and the commencement of the march from Sinai on the twentieth day of the second month of the same year. But while this was the whole of the Sinaitic legislation "out of the tabernacle," there were also laws given on Mount Sinai itself during the last nine months of the first year of the march from Egypt, which are recounted in Exod. xix.—xl. While, therefore, Leviticus is very closely connected with the early part of Numbers on one side, it is very closely connected with the latter part of Exodus on the other.

### ANALYSIS OF ITS CONTENTS.

The book naturally falls into five divisions. The first part is on sacrifice; the second part records the establishment of an hereditary priesthood; the third deals with the question of uncleanness, ceremonial and moral; the fourth enumerates the holy days and seasons. The book ends with a fifth

---

part, consisting of an exhortation to obedience, and there is attached to it an appendix on vows. The following is a more detailed sketch of the contents.

### § 1. *Sacrifice.*

A question is often asked whether the idea underlying Jewish sacrifice is (1) that of a gift to God, the Giver of all good things, by man, the grateful receiver of his gifts; or (2) that of appeasing and satisfying the justice of an averted Deity; or (3) that of symbolically manifesting full submission to his will; or (4) that of exhibiting a sense of union between God and his people. And this question cannot be answered until the different sacrifices have been distinguished from one another. For each of these ideas is represented by one or other of the sacrifices—the first by the meat offering, the second by the sin offering and trespass offering, the third by the burnt offering, the fourth by the peace offering. If the question be, Which of these was the primary idea of Hebrew sacrifice? we may probably say that it was that of symbolical self-surrender or submission in token of perfect loyalty of heart; for the burnt sacrifice, with which the meat offering is essentially allied appears to have been the most ancient of the sacrifices; and this is the thought embodied in the combined burnt and meat offering. But while this is the special idea of the burnt sacrifice, it is not the only idea of it. It contains within itself in a minor degree the ideas of atonement (ch. i. 4) and of peace (ch. i. 9, 18, 17). Thus it is the most complex as well as the oldest form of sacrifice. If we had no historical information to guide us (as we have Gen. iv. 4), we might reasonably argue from this very complexity to the greater antiquity of the burnt and meat offerings. Symbolism first embodies a large idea in an institution, and it then distinguishes the institution into different species or parts in order to represent as a primary notion one or other of the ideas only secondarily expressed or suggested in the original institution. The sin and trespass offerings, therefore, would naturally spring, or, we may say, be divided off, from the burnt and meat offerings, when men wanted to accentuate the idea of the necessity of reconciliation and atonement; and the peace offering, when they wished to express the joy felt by those who were conscious that their reconciliation had been effected.

The sacrifice of Cain and Abel appears to have been a thanksgiving offering of the firstfruits of the produce of the land and of the cattle, presented to the Lord as a token of recognition of him as the Lord and Giver of all. It is called by the name of *minchah*—a word afterwards confined in its signification to the meat offering—and it partook of the character of the meat offering, the burnt offering, and the peace offering (Gen. iv. 3, 4). Noah's sacrifices were burnt offerings (Gen. viii. 20); and this was the general character of subsequent offerings, though something of the nature of peace offerings is indicated by Moses when he distinguishes "sacrifices" from "burnt offerings," in addressing Pharaoh before the departure of the Israelites from Egypt (Exod. x. 25). The full idea of sacrifice, contained implicitly in

the previous sacrifices, was first developed and exhibited in an explicit form by the Levitical regulations and institutions, which distinguish burnt offerings, meat offerings, peace offerings, sin offerings, and trespass offerings ; and the special significations of these several sacrifices have to be combined once more, in order to arrive at the original, but at first less clearly defined, notion of the institution, and to constitute an adequate type of that which was the one Antitype of them all.

The typical character of sacrifices must not be confounded with their symbolical character. While they symbolize the need of reconciliation (sin and trespass offerings), of loyal submission (burnt and meat offerings), and of peace (peace offering), they are the type of the one Sacrifice of Christ, in which perfect submission was yielded (burnt offering) and exhibited (meat offering) by man to God ; by which reconciliation between God and man were wrought by means of atonement (sin offering) and satisfaction (trespass offering) ; and through which the peace effected between God and man was set forth (peace offering). (See Notes and Homiletics on chs. i.—vii.)

The Section, or Part, on sacrifice, consists of chs. i.—vii.

Ch. i. contains the law of the burnt offering.

Ch. ii.        "        "        meat offering.

Ch. iii.        "        "        peace offering.

Chs. iv., v. 1—13        "        sin offering.

Chs. v. 14—35 ; vi. 1—7        "        trespass offering.

The following chapter and a half contain more definite instructions as to the ritual of the sacrifices, addressed particularly to the priests, namely—

Ch. vi. 8—13. The ritual of the burnt offering.

      " 14—23.        "        meat offering, and in particular of the priests' meat offering at their consecration.

      " 24—30. The ritual of the sin offering.

Ch. vii. 1—10.        "        trespass offering.

      " 11—21 ; 28—34        "        peace offering.

      " 22—27 contain a prohibition of eating the fat and the blood.

      " 35—38 form the conclusion of Part I.

## § 2. *Priesthood.*

The primary idea of a priest is that of a man who performs some function in behalf of men towards God which would not be equally acceptable by God if performed by themselves, and through whom God bestows graces upon men. The first priests were the heads of a family, as Noah ; then the heads of a tribe, as Abraham ; then the heads of a combination of tribes or of a nation, such as Jethro (Exod. ii. 16), Melchizedek (Gen. xiv. 18), Balak (Numb. xxii. 40). In many countries this combination of the highest secular and ecclesiastical office continued to be maintained—for example, in Egypt ; but among the Israelites a sharp line of separation between them was drawn by the appointment of Aaron and his sons to the priesthood.

Priesthood and sacrifice are not originally correlative. A man who

acts in behalf of others towards God, whether by making known to him their wants or interceding for them, is thereby a priest; and again, a man who acts in behalf of God towards man, by declaring to them his will and conveying to them his blessing, is thereby a priest. Sacrifice being one means, and at a particular time the chief means, of "calling upon" or approaching God and of receiving graces at his hands, it naturally fell to the priest to perform it as one of his functions, and by degrees it came to be regarded as his special function, and yet never in so exclusive a manner as to shut out the functions of benediction and intercession. The man through whose action, sacramental or otherwise, God's graces are derived to man, and man's needs are presented to God, is, by that action, a priest of God. To suppose that sacrifice, and in particular the sacrifice of animals, is necessary for either one or the other of the priestly functions, is to narrow the idea of priesthood in an unjustifiable manner.

When so complex a system as that of the Levitical sacrifices had been instituted, the appointment of an hereditary priesthood became necessary. And this appointment took away from the heads of families and the tribe leaders the old priestly rights which up to that time they had maintained, and which we see to have been exercised by Moses. We cannot doubt that this abolition of their ancient privileges must have been resented by many of the elder generation, and we find that it was necessary to enforce the new discipline by a strict injunction, forbidding sacrifices to be offered elsewhere than in the court of the tabernacle, and by other hands than those of the hereditary priesthood (see Notes and Homiletics on chs. viii.—x. and xviii.).

The Section, or Part, on the priesthood consists of chs. viii.—x.

Ch. viii. contains the ceremonies of the consecration of Aaron and his sons.

Ch. ix. recounts their first priestly offerings and benediction.

Ch. x. contains the account of the death of Nadab and Abihu, and the law against drinking wine while ministering to the Lord.

These three chapters constitute Part II.

### § 3. *Uncleanness and its Removal.*

Offences are of two kinds, ceremonial and moral; the former must be purged by purifying rites, the latter by punishment. A ceremonial offence is committed by incurring legal uncleanness, and this is done (1) by eating unclean food or touching unclean bodies (ch. xi.), (2) by childbirth (ch. xii.), (3) by leprosy (chs. xiii., xiv.), (4) by issues (ch. xv.); whoever offended in any of these ways had to purge his offence—in light cases by washing, in grave cases by sacrifice.

Moral offences are committed by transgressing God's moral law, whether written on the human heart or in his Law. The list of these offences commences with an enumeration of unlawful marriages and lusts (ch. xviii.), to which are added other sins and crimes (ch. xix.). They must not be allowed to go unpunished; else they bring the wrath of God upon the nation. The penalties differ according to the heinousness of the

offence, but if they are not exacted, the guilt passes to the community. Yet a certain concession to human frailty is allowed. Moral offences differ in their character, according as they are committed with a determinate resolution to offend, or have arisen from inadvertence or moral weakness. It is for the former class that punishment, either at the hands of man or of God, is a necessity. The latter are regarded more leniently, and may be atoned for by a trespass offering, after the wrong inflicted by them on others has been compensated.

But after every purification for ceremonial and inadvertent moral faults has been made, and all penalties for presumptuous sins and crimes have been duly exacted, there will remain a residue of unatoned-for evil, and for the removal of this the ceremonial of the great Day of Atonement is instituted (see Notes and Homiletics on chs. xi.—xxii.).

The Section, or Part, on uncleanness and its "putting away," contained in chs. xi.—xxii., consists of four divisions: chs. xi.—xv.; chs. xvi., xvii.; chs. xviii.—xx.; and chs. xxi., xxii. The first division has to do with ceremonial uncleanness, arising from four specified causes, and its purification; the second with general uncleanness and its purification on the Day of Atonement; the third with moral uncleanness and its punishment; the fourth with the ceremonial and moral uncleanness of priests, and their physical disqualifications.

First division: Ch. xi. Uncleanness derived from eating or touching unclean flesh, whether of beasts, fishes, birds, insects, or vermin.

Ch. xii. Uncleanness derived from the concomitants of childbirth, and its purification.

Chs. xiii., xiv. Uncleanness accruing from leprosy to men, clothes, and houses, and its purification.

Ch. xv. Uncleanness derived from various issues of the body, and its purification.

Second division: Ch. xvi. General uncleanness of the congregation and of the tabernacle, and its purification by the ceremonies of the Day of Atonement.

Ch. xvii. Corollary to all the preceding part of the book. That sacrifices (chs. i.—viii.), which are the means of purification (chs. xi.—xvi.), are, since the institution of the hereditary priesthood (chs. viii.—x.), to be only offered at the door of the tabernacle.

Third division: Ch. xviii. Moral uncleanness connected with marriage forbidden.

Ch. xix. Other moral uncleanness forbidden.

Ch. xx. Penalties for moral uncleanness, and exhortation to holiness.

Fourth division: Chs. xxi., xxii. 1—16. Ceremonial and moral cleanliness required in an extra degree in priests, and freedom from physical blemish.

Ch. xxii. 17—33. Freedom from blemish and from imperfection required in sacrifices.

These chapters constitute Part III.

#### § 4. *Holy Days and Seasons.*

The weekly holy day was the sabbath. The injunction to observe it was coeval with the origin of mankind. It kept in mind the rest of God

after his creative work, and foreshadowed the rest of Christ after his redeeming work. It anticipated the rest of his people in Canaan, and the further rest of the Christian dispensation, and the still further rest of paradise.

The monthly holy days were the new moons on the first day of each month ; among which the new moon of the seventh month held a sevenfold sanctity, and was also observed as the New Year's Day of the civil year, being sometimes inexactly called the Feast of Trumpets.

The yearly holy days began in the first month with the festival of the Passover, to which was closely attached that of Unleavened Bread. These two festivals, united into one, represented historically the fact of Israel's deliverance from the bondage of Egypt, and typically they represented the future deliverance of the spiritual Israel from the bondage of sin, both at the first and at the second coming of Christ. The lamb, the exhibition of whose blood delivered from destruction, was a type of Christ. The festival served also as the spring harvest feast of the year.

The Feast of Pentecost, or the Feast of Weeks, observed seven weeks after the Passover, was the second or summer harvest festival. It might possibly have commemorated the gift of the Law at Sinai: it certainly was the day on which was instituted the new Law in Jerusalem (Acts ii.).

The fast of the Day of Atonement, observed on the tenth day of the seventh month, symbolically represented the removal of the sins of the world by Christ, at once the Sacrifice for sin offered on the cross (the sacrificed goat), and the Deliverer from the consciousness of the power of sin (the scapegoat). It also typified the entry of Christ into heaven in the character of our Great High Priest, with the virtue of his blood of Atonement, there to abide as the prevailing Mediator and Intercessor for his people.

The Feast of Tabernacles, celebrated for a week beginning on the fifteenth day of the seventh month, was the last and most joyous harvest-home festival of the year. Historically, it looked back to the day of joy when, safe in their booths at Succoth, the children of Israel felt the happiness of the freedom from Egyptian bondage which they had at last attained (Exod. xii. 37); and it looked forward to the period of peaceful enjoyment which was to come with the institution of Christ's kingdom on earth, and beyond that time, to the glories of the Church triumphant in heaven.

The sabbatical year, which required that every seventh year should be a year free from agricultural toil, enforced on a large scale the teaching of the sabbath, and it taught the lesson afterwards illustrated in the contrast of the lives of Mary and Martha (Luke x. 38—42), and the duty of trusting to the providence of God.

The jubilee, which restored all things that had been changed or depraved to their original state every fifty years, while it served as a means of preserving the commonwealth from confusion and revolution, foreshadowed the Christian dispensation, and after that the final restitution of all things (see Notes and Homiletics on chs. xxiii.—xxv.).

---

The Section, or Part, on holy days and seasons comprises chs. **xxiii.**—**xxv.**  
Ch. **xxiii.** The sacred days on which holy convocations are to be held.  
Ch. **xxiv.** Parenthetical. On the oil for the lamps, and the shewbread, and on  
blasphemy.  
Ch. **xxv.** The sabbatical year and the jubilee.

*§ 5. Final Exhortation.*

Many of the laws in the Book of Leviticus are without the sanction of any penalty. They are commanded, and therefore they ought to be obeyed. In place of a regular code of penalties for individual transgressions, and in addition to the penalties already declared, Moses pronounces blessing and cursing on the nation at large, according as it obeys or disobeys the Law. The rewards and punishments of a future life have no place here, as nations have no future existence. Twice in the Book of Deuteronomy Moses introduces similar exhortations (chs. **xi.**, **xxviii.**). As a matter of history, we find that as long as the nation was, as such, loyal to Jehovah, it prospered, and that when it fell away from him the evils here denounced overtook it.

The exhortation is contained in ch. **xxvi.**

*§ 6. Appendix—Vows.*

The subject of vows is not introduced into the body of the book, because it was not the purpose of the legislation to institute them or to encourage them. At the conclusion a short treatise is added, giving no special approbation of them, but regulating them, if made, and appointing a scale of redemption or commutation.

This appendix occupies the last chapter—ch. **xxvii.**—being attached to the rest by a final declaration that it belongs to the Sinaitic legislation.

**2. AUTHORSHIP AND DATE.**

The question of authorship does not properly arise on this book. Whatever may be said of Genesis and Deuteronomy, the second, third, and fourth of the books of Moses stand or fall together, nor is there anything in the Book of Leviticus to separate it in respect to authenticity from Exodus which precedes, and Numbers which follows it. There is only one passage in it which can be regarded as seeming to indicate an author of later date than Moses. This is the following passage: “That the land spue not you out also, when ye defile it, as it spued out the nations that were before you” (ch. **xviii.** 28). It has been argued with some plausibility that, as Canaan had not spued out its inhabitants till after the death of Moses, these words must have been written by some one who lived later than Moses. But an examination of the context takes away all the force of this argument. The eighteenth chapter is directed against incestuous marriages and lusts; and, after the lawgiver has ended his prohibitions, he proceeds: “Defile not ye yourselves in any of these things: for in all these the nations are defiled which I cast out before you: and the land is defiled: therefore I do visit the iniquity thereof upon it, and the

land itself vomiteth out her inhabitants. Ye shall therefore keep my statutes and my judgments, and shall not commit any of these abominations; neither any of your own nation, nor any stranger that sojourneth among you: (for all these abominations have the men of the land done which were before you, and the land is defiled;) that the land spue not you out also, when ye defile it, as it spued out the nations that were before you." In this passage, the words translated "vomiteth" and "spued" are in the same tense. It is that tense which is ordinarily called a perfect. But this so-called perfect does not necessarily indicate a past time. Indeed, the Hebrew tenses do not, as such, express time, but only (when in the active voice) action. We must look to the context in order to discover the time in which the act takes place, took place, or will take place. In the passage before us the words, "I cast out," in ver. 24 are expressed by a participle, "used of that which is certainly and speedily coming to pass" (Keil), meaning, "I am casting out;" and by a law of the Hebrew language, as this participle and the rest of the context indicate present time, the two verbs under consideration must indicate present time also. Even if we were compelled to translate the two words as perfects, there would be nothing impossible or unnatural in God's saying to Moses, and to the children of Israel through him, that the land "has vomited," or "has spued out," the nations of Canaan, the act being regarded as in the Divine mind done, because determined on and in the course of immediate accomplishment. Or, still again, the land might be said to "have spued out" the nations of Canaan in relation to the time when it should spue out the degenerate Israelites.

Putting aside this passage, so easily explained, there is nothing in the whole book which is incompatible with the authorship and the date of Moses. This being so, the fact that it has come down to us as the work of Moses, and that it by implication professes itself to be the work of Moses, and that its character and language are, so far as we can judge, such as would be in accordance with a work of Moses, leave the hypothesis of the authorship of Moses as certain, on the score of internal evidence, as any such hypothesis can be. Nor is there wanting any external evidence which could be expected to exist. The Book of Joshua recognizes the existence of "the Book of the Law of Moses" (Josh. xxii. 6; cf. i. 8; viii. 31—35). In the Book of Judges there is an apparent reference to Lev. xxvi. 16, 17, in ch. ii. 15 ("Whithersoever they went out, the hand of the Lord was against them for evil, as the Lord had said, and as the Lord had sworn unto them"); and in ch. iii. 4 we find mention of "the commandments of the Lord, which he commanded their fathers by the hand of Moses." In the Book of Judges, "the sacred character of the Levites, their dispersion among the several tribes, the settlement of the high priesthood in the family of Aaron, the existence of the ark of the covenant, the power of inquiring of God and obtaining answers, the irrevocability of a vow, the distinguishing mark of circumcision, the distinction between

clean and unclean meats, the law of the Nazarites, the use of burnt offerings and peace offerings, the employment of trumpets as a means of obtaining Divine aid in war, the impiety of setting up a king," are enumerated by Canon Rawlinson as "severally acknowledged, and constituting together very good evidence that the Mosaic ceremonial law was already in force" ('Aids to Faith: The Pentateuch,' London, 1862). In the Book of Samuel, "we meet at once with Eli, the high priest of the house of Aaron, . . . the lamp burns in the tabernacle, . . . the ark of the covenant is in the sanctuary, and is esteemed the sacred symbol of the presence of God (1 Sam. iv. 3, 4, 18, 21, 22; v. 3, 4, 6, 7; vi. 19) . . . there is the altar and the incense and the ephod worn by the high priest (1 Sam. ii. 28). The various kinds of Mosaic sacrifices are referred to: the burnt offering (*olah*, 1 Sam. x. 8; xiii. 9; xv. 22), the peace offerings (*shelamim*, 1 Sam. x. 8; xi. 15; xiii. 9), the bloody sacrifice (*zebach*, 1 Sam. ii. 19), and the unbloody offering (*minchah*, 1 Sam. ii. 19; iii. 14; xxvi. 19). The animals offered in sacrifice—the bullock (1 Sam. xxiv. 25), the lamb (1 Sam. xvi. 2), and the ram (1 Sam. xv. 22)—are those prescribed in the Levitical code. The especial customs of the sacrifices alluded to in 1 Sam. ii. 13 were those prescribed in Lev. vi. 6, 7; Numb. xviii. 8—xix. 25, 32; Deut. xviii. 1, *sqq.*" (Bishop Harold Browne, 'Introduction to the Pentateuch,' in 'The Speaker's Commentary'). In the Books of Kings and Chronicles there are frequent allusions or references to the "Law of Moses" and its enactments (see 1 Kings ii. 3; viii. 9, 53; 2 Kings vii. 3; xi. 12; xxii. 8; xxiii. 3, 25; 1 Chron. xvi. 40; xxii. 12, 13; 2 Chron. xxv. 4; xxxiii. 8; xxxiv. 14). So too in Ezra and Nehemiah (see Ezra iii. 2—6; vi. 18; vii. 6; Neh. i. 7—9; vii. 1—18; ix. 14); and in Daniel (see Dan. ix. 11—13). Amos (ii. 7) apparently quotes Lev. xx. 3; Hosea (iv. 10) seems to quote Lev. xxvi. 26. Joel, the earliest of the prophets of the southern kingdom, implies throughout his prophecy the existence of the Levitical system, and he and Ezekiel appear to have undoubtedly had before them the twenty-sixth chapter of Leviticus (Joel i. 13, 14, 16; ii. 1, 14—27; Ezek. xxxiv. 25—31). The New Testament assumes throughout the Mosaic original of the whole Pentateuch.

Taking the authorship of Moses as proved, we have further to inquire as to the date of his composition of the book. On this point we cannot speak with certainty, but we may regard it as in the highest degree probable that the laws were written down as they were delivered to and by Moses during the fifty days previous to the departure of the children of Israel from Sinai, and that they were subsequently put together during one of the encampments in the wilderness.

### 3. LITERATURE.

The literature on Leviticus is very extensive, and belongs for the most part to two classes—commentaries on the Pentateuch with their introductions, and special dissertations on one or other of the subjects with which the Book of Leviticus deals. We make a selection of works under both headings.

To the first class belong Origen, 'Selecta in Levit.', 'Hom. in Levit.' (Op., tom. ii. LEVITICUS.

p. 180, edit. Delarue); St. Augustine, 'Quæstiones in Heptateuchum,' *Liber Tertius* (Op., tom. iii. p. 674, edit. Migne); Theodoret, 'Quæstiones in Levit.' (Op., tom. i. p. 114, edit. Sirmond); Cyril of Alexandria, 'Glaphyra in Libros Mosis'; Bede, 'In Pentateuchum Commentarii—Leviticus' (Op., tom. ii. p. 334, edit. Migne); Calvin, 'Commentarii in Quatuor Mosis Libros' (Op., tom. i. p. 248, Amsterdam, 1671); 'Poli Synopsis Criticorum' (tom. i. p. 510, London, 1669); 'Criticæ Sacri' (vol. ii., Amsterdam, 1698); Clericus (Le Clerc), 'Mosis Prophete, Lib. IV.' (vol. i. p. 207, Amsterdam, 1710); Carpzov, 'Introductio ad Libros Veteris Testamenti: De Levitico' (p. 100, Leipzig, 1727); Matthew Henry, 'Commentary' (vol. i., 1737); Rosenmüller, 'Scholia' (Leipzig, 1824); Hävernick, 'Handbuch der Historisch-Kritischen Einleitung in das Alte Testament: Leviticus,' §§ 117—130 (Erlangen, 1836), and (a part of the above) his 'Introduction to the Pentateuch' (published by T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1850); Hengstenberg, 'On the Pentateuch' (translated by Ryland, Edinburgh, 1847); Keil and Delitzsch, 'On the Pentateuch' (translated by Martin, vol. ii., T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1878); Stuart, 'Introduction to the Old Testament'; Bush, 'Commentaries on the Five Books of Moses'; Baylee, 'Course of Biblical Instruction' (vol. i., St. Aidan's, 1865); Wordsworth, 'Commentary' (part ii., London, 1865); Harold Browne, 'Introduction to the Pentateuch' (in the 'Speaker's Commentary,' vol. i., London, 1871); Clark, 'Introduction to and Notes on Leviticus' (ibid.); Bonar, 'Commentary on Leviticus' (London, 1875); Lange, 'Commentary' (vol. ii., edit. Schaff, published by T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh); Blunt, 'Annotated Bible' (vol. i., London, 1878).

Under the second heading come Mede, 'The Christian Sacrifice, Book 2' (vol. i., London, 1664); Outram, 'De Sacrificiis' (London, 1677: English translation, London, 1817); Lightfoot, 'The Temple Service as in the Days of Our Saviour' (vol. i., London, 1684); Spencer, 'De Legibus Hebraeorum' (Cambridge, 1727); J. Mayer, 'De Temporibus Sanctis et Festis Diebus Hebraeorum' (Amsterdam, 1724); Deyling, 'Observationes Sacrae' (Leipzig, 1735); Bähr, 'Die Symbolik des Mosaischen Cultus' (Heidelberg, 1837); Davison, 'Inquiry into Primitive Sacrifice' (in his 'Remains,' Oxford, 1840); Tholuck, 'Das Alte Testament im Neuen Testament' (Hamburg, 1849); Johnstone, 'Israel after the Flesh' (London, 1850); Maurice, 'The Doctrine of Sacrifice deduced from Scripture' (Cambridge, 1864); Fairbairn, 'The Typology of Scripture' (Edinburgh, 1854); Freeman, 'Principles of Divine Service' (London, 1855); Hengstenberg, 'Die Opfer der Heiligen Schrift' (Berlin, 1859); Kurtz, 'Der Alttestamentliche Opfercultus' (Mittau, 1864); Barry, Articles on 'Sacrifice' (in Smith's 'Dictionary of the Bible,' London, 1860); Rawlinson, Essay on 'The Pentateuch' (in 'Aids to Faith,' London, 1862); Kuepfer, 'Das Priestenthum des Alten Bundes,' 1865; Ebers, 'Egypten und die Bücher Moses' (Leipzig, 1868); Jukes, 'Law of Offerings'; Marriott, 'On Terms of Gift and Offering' (in his 'Memorials,' London, 1872); Edersheim, 'The Temple Service'; Willis, 'The Worship of the Old Covenant' (Oxford, 1880).

Philo Judæus (Op., Frankfort, 1691), and the Mishna (Surenhus. Amsterdam, 1688), should also be consulted.

# THE BOOK OF LEVITICUS.

---

## PART I.

### THE LAWS AND REGULATIONS RESPECTING SACRIFICES.

#### EXPOSITION.

##### CHAPTER I.

**THE SACRIFICES** (chs. i.—vii.). There are five classes of sacrifices instituted or regulated in the first seven chapters of Leviticus, each of which has its special signification—the burnt offering, the meat offering, the sin offering, the trespass offering, and the peace offering. The burnt offering, in which the whole of the victim was consumed in the fire on God's altar, signifies entire self-surrender on the part of the offerer; the meat offering, a loyal acknowledgment of God's sovereignty; the sin offering, propitiation of wrath in him to whom the offering is made, and expiation of sin in the offerer; the trespass offering, satisfaction for sin; the peace offering, union and communion between the offerer and him to whom the offering is made.

The burnt offering (ch. i.) typifies the perfect surrender of himself, made by the Lord Jesus Christ, and exhibited by his life and death on earth; and it teaches the duty of self-sacrifice on the part of man.

Ver. 1.—**And the LORD called unto Moses.** The first word of the verse, in the original *Vayikra*, meaning “and called,” has been taken as the designation of the book in the Hebrew Bible. The title *Leviticon*, or *Leviticus*, was first adopted by the LXX., to

indicate that it had for its main subject the duties and functions appertaining to the chief house of the priestly tribe of Levi. The word “and” connects the third with the second book of the Pentateuch. God is spoken of in this and in the next book almost exclusively under the appellation of “the LORD” or “Jehovah,” the word “Elohim” being, however, used sufficiently often to identify the two names. Cf. ch. ii. 13, xix. 12. **And spake unto him.** The manner in which God ordinarily communicated with a prophet was by “a vision” or “in a dream;” but this was not the case with Moses; “My servant Moses is not so, who is faithful in all mine house; with him will I speak mouth to mouth, even apparently” (Numb. xii. 8). The Levitical code of laws, therefore, was delivered to Moses in his ordinary mental state, not in trance, or dream, or ecstasy. **Out of the tabernacle of the congregation.** The tabernacle had just been set up by Moses (Exod. xl. 16). It derives its name of *the congregation*, or rather of *meeting*, from being the place where God met the representatives of his people (see Numb. xvi. 42). Hitherto God had spoken from the mount, now he speaks from the mercy-seat of the ark in the tabernacle. He had symbolically drawn near to his people, and the sacrificial system is now instituted as the means by which they should draw nigh to him. All the laws in the Book of Leviticus, and in the first ten chapters of the Book of

LEVITICUS.

B

Numbers, were given during the fifty days which intervened between the setting up of the tabernacle (Exod. xl. 17) and the departure of the children of Israel from the neighbourhood of Mount Sinai (Numb. x. 11).

Ver 2.—*If any man of you bring.* Sacrifices are not now being instituted for the first time. Burnt offerings at least, if not peace offerings, had existed since the time of the Fall. The Levitical law lays down regulations adapting an already existing practice for the use of the Israelitish nation; it begins, therefore, not with a command, “Thou shalt bring,” but, *if any man of you* (according to custom) *bring.* Any member of the congregation might bring his voluntary offering when he would. The times at which the public offerings were to be made, and their number, are afterwards designated. An offering. This verse is introductory to the ensuing chapters, and speaks of “offerings” in general. “*Korban*,” which is the word here used for “offering,” derived from *karab*, meaning “to draw near for the sake of presentation,” is the generic name including all offerings and sacrifices. It is used in speaking of animal sacrifices of various kinds, including peace offerings and sin offerings (ch. iii. 1; iv. 23) and it is applied to vegetable offerings (ch. ii. 1, 18), and to miscellaneous offerings for the service of the tabernacle, such as wagons and oxen, silver vessels for the altar, gold, jewels, etc. (Numb. vii. 3, 10; xxxi. 50). It is translated by the LXX. into Greek by the word *δῶσπος*, equivalent to the Latin *donum*, and our “gift.” These offerings are now distinguished into their different kinds.

Ver. 3.—*If his offering be a burnt sacrifice.* The Hebrew term for “burnt sacrifice” is *olah*, meaning “that which ascends;” sometimes *kaleed*, “whole offering,” is found (Deut. xxiii. 10); the LXX. use the word *δοκαύτημα*, “whole burnt offering.” The conditions to be fulfilled by an Israelite who offered a burnt sacrifice were the following:—1. He must offer either (1) a young bull without blemish, or (2) a young ram, or (3) a young he-goat, or (4) a turtle-dove, or (5) a young pigeon. 2. In case it were a bull, ram, or goat, he must bring it to the door of the tabernacle, that is, the entrance of the court in front of the brazen altar and of the door of the holy place, and there offer or present it. 3. In offering it he must place his hand firmly on its head, as a ceremonial act. 4. He must kill it, either himself or by the agency of a Levite. 5. He must flay it. 6. He must divide it into separate portions. 7. He must wash the intestines and legs. Meantime the priests had their parts to do; they had 1. To catch the blood, to carry it

to the altar, and to strike the inner sides of the altar with it. 2. To arrange the fire on the altar. 3. To place upon the altar the head, and the fat, and the remainder of the animal, for consumption by the fire. 4. To sprinkle or place a meat offering upon them. 5. The next morning, still dressed in their priestly garments, to take the ashes off the altar, and to place them at the east of the altar (oh. vi. 10). 6. To carry them outside the camp to a clean place, the bearer being dressed in his ordinary costume (ch. vi. 11). There were, therefore, four essential parts in the ritual of the burnt offering—the oblation of the victim (vers. 3, 4), the immolation (ver. 5), the oblation of the blood, representing the life (*ibid.*), and the consumption (ver. 9)—the first two to be performed by the offerer, the third by the priest, the fourth by the fire representing the action of God. The moral lesson taught by the burnt offering was the necessity of self-surrender and of devotion to God, even to the extent of yielding up life and the very tenement of life. As the offerer could not give up his own life and body and still live, the life of an animal belonging to him, and valued by him, was substituted for his own; but he knew, and by laying his hand on its head showed that he knew, that it was his own life and his very self that was represented by the animal. The mystical lessons taught to those who could grasp them were—1. The doctrine of substitution or vicarious suffering. 2. The fact that without the shedding of blood there was no acceptance. 3. The need of One who, being very man, should be able to perform an action of perfect surrender of his will and of his life. The fulfilment of the type is found in the perfect submision of Christ as man, throughout his ministry, and especially in the Garden of Gethsemane, and in the offering made by him, as Priest and willing Victim, of his life upon the altar of the cross. The burnt offering is to be without blemish, for had not the animal been perfect in its kind, it would not have served its moral, its mystical, or its typical purpose. The word *καύσως*, used by the LXX. as equivalent to the Hebrew term, is applied to Christ in Heb. ix. 14 and 1 Pet. i. 19; and St. Paul teaches that it is the purpose of God that those who are adopted in Christ should also be “holy and without blemish” (Eph. i. 4). A priest had to certify that the victim was free from all defects. *He shall offer it of his own voluntary will* should rather be translated, *He shall offer it for his own acceptance.* The animal, representing the offerer, was presented by the latter in order that he might be himself accepted by the Lord. This aspect of the offering is brought out more clearly by the *minchah*, or

meat offering, which always accompanied the burnt offering. The place where the presentation took place was the door of the tabernacle, that is, the space immediately within the eastern entrance into the court of the tabernacle, immediately facing the brazen altar, which stood before the east end of the tabernacle, where was the door or entrance which led into the holy place. "The presenting of the victim at the entrance of the tabernacle was a symbol of the free will submitting itself to the Law of the Lord" (Clarke). Cf. Rom. xii. 1: "I beseech you that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is in your reasonable service."

Ver. 4.—*And he shall put his hand upon the head of the burnt offering.* This putting, or forcibly leaning, the hand on the victim's head, which is the most essential part of the oblation of the victim, was a symbolical act implying "This animal is now for present purposes myself, and its life is my life." It was this act of identification with the offerer which made it be accepted for him to make atonement (literally, *covering*) for him. The sin offering is the sacrifice which especially symbolizes and ceremonially effects atonement, but the idea of atonement is not absent from the burnt sacrifice. The aspect under which atonement is presented here and elsewhere in the Old Testament is that of covering. But it is not the sin that is covered, but the sinner. Owing to his sin, the latter is exposed to the wrath of a just God, but something intervenes whereby he is covered, and he ceases, therefore, to attract the Divine anger and punishment. No longer being an object of wrath, he becomes at once an object of benevolence and mercy. The covering provided by a sacrifice is the blood or life of an animal, symbolically representing the offerer's own life freely surrendered by him for his acceptance, and typically foreshadowing the blood of Christ.

Ver. 5.—*And he shall kill the bullock.* After having made the presentation, the offerer proceeds to the second part of the sacrifice, the immolation or slaying, which was to be performed before the Lord, that is, in front of the tabernacle, on the north side of the brazen altar. Then follows the third part of the sacrifice: the priests, Aaron's sons, shall bring the blood, and sprinkle the blood round about upon the altar. The priests caught the blood (sometimes the Levites were allowed to do this, 2 Chron. xxx. 16), and *sprinkled* or rather *threw it round about on the altar*, that is, so as to touch all the inner sides of the altar. "A red line all round the middle of the altar marked that above it the blood of sacrifices intended to be eaten, below it

that of sacrifices wholly consumed, was to be sprinkled" (Edersheim, 'The Temple'). This was in some respects the most essential part of the ceremony, the blood representing the life (ch. xvii. 11), which was symbolically received at the hands of the offerer, and presented by the priests to God. In the antitype our Lord exercised the function of the sacrificing priest when he presented his own life to the Father, as he hung upon the altar of the cross.

Ver. 6.—*He shall flay the burnt offering.* The hide was given to the priest (ch. vii. 8). The whole of the remainder of the animal was consumed by the fire of the altar; none of it was eaten by the offerer and his friends as in the peace offerings, or even by the ministers of God as in the sin offerings; it was a whole burnt offering. *His pieces*, into which it was to be cut, means the customary pieces.

Ver. 7.—*The priest shall put fire upon the altar.* The fire once kindled was never to be allowed to go out (ch. vi. 13). Unless, therefore, these words refer to the first occasion only on which a burnt sacrifice was offered, they must mean "make up the fire on the altar," or it might possibly have been the practice, as Bishop Wordsworth (after Maimonides) supposes, that fresh fire was added to the altar fire before each sacrifice.

Ver. 8.—*And the priests shall lay the parts, the head, and the fat, in order.* The head and the fat are designated by name, because, with the "pieces," they complete the whole of the animal with the exception of the hide. The order in which they were laid is said to have been the same approximately as that which the members held in the living creature.

Ver. 9.—*The priest shall burn all on the altar, etc.* The fourth and last part of the sacrifice. The word employed is not the common term used for destroying by fire, but means "make to ascend." The life of the animal has already been offered in the blood; now the whole of its substance is "made to ascend" to the Lord. Modern science, by showing that the effect of fire upon the substance of a body is to resolve it into gases which rise from it, contributes a new illustration to the verse. The vapour that ascends is not something different from that which is burnt, but the very thing itself, its essence; which, having ascended, is of a sweet savour unto the Lord, that is, acceptable and well-pleasing to him. The burnt offering, the meat offering, and the peace offering, are sacrifices of sweet savour (ch. ii. 2; iii. 5); the expression is not used with regard to the sin offering and trespass offering. St. Paul applies it to the sacrifice of Christ, in Eph. v. 2, "As Christ also loved us, and gave himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to

God for a sweet-smelling savour;" thus indicating, in an incidental manner, the connection between the Jewish sacrifices and the sacrifice of Christ, as type and antitype.

Ver. 10.—*If his offering be of the flocks.* The ritual of the burnt offering was the same, whether the victim was a bull, sheep, or goat.

Ver. 11.—*He shall kill it on the side of the altar, northward before the Lord.* In the sacrifice of the bullock it is only "before the Lord" (ver. 5). No doubt the same place is meant in both cases, but it is specified with more exactness here. On the western side of the altar was the tabernacle, on the east side the heap of ashes (ch. i. 16), on the south side probably the ascent to the altar (see Josephus, 'De Bell. Jud.', v. 5, 6); on the north side, therefore, was the most convenient slaughtering-place, and this is probably the reason for the injunction.

Ver. 14.—*If the burnt sacrifice for his offering to the Lord be of fowls.* A comparison of ch. xii. 8 leads us to infer that the permission to offer a bird was a concession to poverty. The pigeon and the turtle-dove were the most easy to procure, as the domestic fowl was at this time unknown to the Hebrews. The first and only allusion in the Bible to the hen occurs in the New Testament (Matt. xxiii. 37; Luke xiii. 34), nor is there any representation of the do-

mestic fowl in ancient Egyptian paintings. The domicile of the bird was still confined to India. A single pigeon or turtle-dove formed a sacrifice, and there was no rule in respect to sex, as there was in the case of the quadrupeds.

Ver. 15.—*The priest shall bring it unto the altar.* The difference in the ritual for the burnt sacrifice of fowls is: 1. That the offerer is not commanded to lay his hand on the bird. 2. That the altar is the place of maceration, instead of the space on the north side of the altar. 3. That the priest slays it instead of the offerer. 4. That the blood (owing to its smaller quantity) is pressed out against the side of the altar instead of being caught in a vessel and thrown on it. There is no essential variation here; the analogy of the sacrifice of the animal is followed so far as circumstances permit. It is not certain that the word *malak*, translated *wring off his head*, means more than "make an incision with the nail;" but in all probability the head was to be severed and laid on the fire separately, after the manner of the other sacrifices.

Ver. 16.—*With his feathers, rather the contents of the crop.* This and the ashes are to be placed beside the altar on the east part, as being furthest from the tabernacle and nearest to the entrance of the court, so that they might be readily removed.

#### HOMILETICS.

Vers. 1, 2.—*The sacrificial system.* The religion of Israel, as exhibited to us in the Law, bears at first sight a strange appearance, unlike what we should have expected. We read in it very little about a future life, and not much about repentance, faith, and prayer, but we find commanded an elaborate system of sacrifices, based upon a practice almost coeval with the Fall.

I. **SACRIFICE WAS USED IN ANTE-MOSAIC DAYS AS A MEANS OF APPROACH TO GOD.** "In process of time it came to pass that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the Lord. And Abel, he also brought of the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof" (Gen. iv. 4). The covenant with Noah was made by sacrifice: "And Noah builded an altar unto the Lord, and took of every clean beast and of every clean fowl, and offered burnt offerings on the altar. And the Lord smelled a sweet savour. . . . And God spake unto Noah, and to his sons with him, saying, And I, behold, I establish my covenant with you, and with your seed after you" (Gen. viii. 20, 21; ix. 8, 9). When Abraham first entered Canaan, he "builded an altar unto the Lord who appeared unto him" (Gen. xii. 7), as the means of communicating with him. At his next halting-place, "he builded an altar unto the Lord," as the means of "calling upon the name of the Lord" (Gen. xii. 8; xiii. 4). On removing to Hebron, again he "built there an altar unto the Lord" (Gen. xiii. 18). The covenant with Abraham was made by sacrifice (Gen. xv. 9); and at Jehovah-jireh, Abraham "offered a ram for a burnt offering in the stead of his son" (Gen. xxii. 13). At Beer-sheba Isaac "builded an altar and called upon the name of the Lord" (Gen. xxvi. 25). At Shalem Jacob "erected an altar and called it El-elohe-Israel" (Gen. xxxiii. 20). At Beth-el he "built an altar and called the place El-beth-el" (Gen. xxxv. 7). At Beer-sheba he "offered sacrifices unto the God of his father Isaac" (Gen. xlvi. 1). During the sojourn in Egypt it is probable that the practice of sacrifice was discontinued through fear of

giving offence to the religious feelings of the Egyptians (Exod. viii. 26); but the idea of sacrifice being the appointed means of serving God was preserved (Exod. v. 3; viii. 27). Moses, Aaron, and the elders of Israel took part in a sacrificial meal with Jethro in the wilderness (Exod. xviii. 12). And the covenant made at Sinai was ratified by burnt offerings and peace offerings (Exod. xxiv. 5). Indeed, the Book of Psalms declares the method of entering into covenant with God to be "by sacrifice." "Gather my saints together unto me; those that have made a covenant with me by sacrifice" (Ps. 1. 5). The Christian covenant was thus ratified (Heb. ix. 15), as well as the covenants of Noah, Abraham, and Moses.

**II. THERE ARE THREE CLASSES OF SACRIFICES UNDER THE MOSAIC DISPENSATION, ESSENTIALLY DIFFERING IN CHARACTER—**

Burnt offerings;

Peace offerings;

Sin offerings;

beside Meat offerings, ordinarily attached to the burnt offerings, and

Trespass offerings, a species of sin offering.

**III. WHAT WAS THEIR MEANING.** 1. In general, they served, as before, as a means of reconciliation between God and man, as a means of access for man to God. This purpose they fulfilled to all humble-minded men, whether their full meaning was understood or no. To the more spiritually minded they were also a means of instruction in sacred mysteries to be revealed hereafter.

2. Specifically, they each taught their own lesson and brought about, symbolically and ceremonially, each their own effect.

The sin offering taught the need of, and symbolically effected, the propitiation of God's anger and the expiation of man's sin.

The burnt offering taught the lesson of self-surrender, and symbolically effected the surrender of the offerer to God.

The peace offering taught the lesson of the necessity and joyousness of communion between God and man, and symbolically represented that communion as existing between the offerer and God.

**IV. WHENCE THEY DERIVED THEIR EFFICACY.** Their efficacy was derived from representing and foreshadowing the sacrifice of Christ on the cross, the sin offering typifying the propitiation and expiation once for all there wrought, the burnt offering the perfect self-surrender of the sinless sufferer, the peace offering the reconciliation thereby effected and continued between God and his people.

**Vers. 3—17.—The burnt offering.** It was wholly consumed by the fire of God's altar; nothing was left for the after consumption either of the offerer or even of God's ministers, as in the other sacrifices.

**I. IT TYPIFIES THE ENTIRE SELF-SURRENDER OF CHRIST TO GOD.**

1. In his eternal resolve to redeem by becoming man.

2. In the humility of his birth on earth.

3. In the silence in which his youth was spent.

4. In the narrow limits within which he confined his ministry.

5. In the victory won over his human will in the Garden of Gethsemane.

6. In his yielding his life to his Father on the cross.

**II. EXAMPLE HEREIN TO US.**

1. We must surrender what is evil—

Bad habits, *e.g.* sloth, drunkenness.

Bad affections, *e.g.* love of money, bodily indulgence.

Bad passions, *e.g.* ill temper, pride.

2. We must surrender what God does not think fit to give us, though not in itself evil, such as—

Health,

Domestic happiness,

Worldly success.

**III. THE CHRISTIAN TEMPER RESULTING FROM SELF-SURRENDER.**

1. Acquiescence in God's will.

2. Cheerfulness in rendering that acquiescence.

3. Spiritual peace and happiness arising from the consciousness of having yielded our will to our Father's will.

4. Love to the brethren. Cf. Eph. v. 2: "Walk in love, as Christ also loved us, and gave himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour."

Vers. 5-9.—*Mediation.* The sacrificial act cannot be completed, though it can be begun, by the offerer alone. The intervention of God's priest is requisite, and it is his hand which performs the most solemn portion of the rite. Thus there is taught the need of mediation and of a mediator when a work of atonement is to be accomplished. "The expiation was always made or completed by the priest, as the sanctified mediator between Jehovah and the people, or, previous to the institution of the Aaronic priesthood, by Moses, the chosen mediator of the covenant. . . . It is not Jehovah who makes the expiation, but this is invariably the office or work of a mediator, who intervenes between the holy God and sinful man, and by means of expiation averts the wrath of God from the sinner, and brings the grace of God to bear upon him" (Keil). Hence, the great work of atonement, of which all other atonements are but shadows, was performed by the One Mediator between God and man, the man Jesus Christ.

#### HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

*Entire consecration, as illustrated in the burnt offering.* Ch. i.; cf. Rom. xii. 1.—We start with the assumption that the Book of *Exodus* presents "the history of redemption." It is an account of how the Lord delivered the people he had chosen out of bondage, and brought them to himself (Exod. xix. 4). It contains, moreover, an account of the erection of the tabernacle, or "tent of meeting," where God proposed to dwell as a Pilgrim in the midst of a pilgrim people, and out of which would issue his commands as their Guide and Leader. In this Book of *Leviticus*, then, we have the Lord speaking "out of the tent of meeting" (ver. 1), that is, to a people in covenant relations with himself.

This helps us to understand why the "burnt offering" is treated first. Not only was it the very oldest offering, but it was to be the daily offering (Numb. xxix. 6); morning and evening was a holocaust to be presented to the Lord. It was, therefore, manifestly meant to express the proper state or condition of those professing to be God's covenant people. It is on this account that we entitle this a homily on *Entire Consecration*.

I. THIS IDEA OF ENTIRE CONSECRATION IS ONE WHICH ALL CLASSES OF GOD'S PEOPLE ARE EXPECTED TO EXPRESS. The poor, who could only bring "turtle-doves" or "young pigeons," the representatives of domestic fowls at that time, were just as welcome at the tabernacle as those who could bring lambs or bullocks. Consecration is an idea which can be carried out in any worldly condition. The poor widow with her two mites carried it out more gloriously than her neighbours in the midst of their abundance. Complete self-surrender is not the prerogative of a class, but the possibility and ideal of all.

II. CONFESSION OF SIN IS AN EXPECTED PRELIMINARY TO CONSECRATION. The Jew, whatever was his grade in society, was directed either expressly to "lean" (לְזַעַן) his hand upon the head of his offering, or, as in the case of the fowls where it was physically impossible, to do so by implication; and this was understood to represent, and some believe it to have been regularly accompanied by, confession of sin. Of course, confession of sin is not of the essence of consecration; we have in the case of our blessed Lord, and of the unfallen angels, similar consecration, where no sense of sin is possible. And we are on the way to consecration in the other life, divorced from the sense of sin. Meanwhile, however, confession is only just, since sin remains with us. Indeed, the consecration of redeemed sinners will not prove very deep or thorough where confession of sin is omitted.

III. THE SPECTACLE OF A SUBSTITUTE DYING IN OUR ROOM AND STEAD IS WELL FITTED TO DEEPEN OUR SENSE OF CONSECRATION. The slaughter of the animal, upon whose head the sins have by confession been laid, must have exercised upon the offerer a very solemnizing influence. There is nothing in like manner so fitted to hallow us as

the spectacle of Jesus, to whom these sacrifices pointed, dying on the cross in our stead. The love he manifested in that death for us constrains us to live, not unto ourselves, but unto him who died for us and rose again (2 Cor. v. 14, 15). The moral power of *substitution* cannot be dispensed with in a sinful world like this.

**IV. THE ACCEPTANCE OF THE BLOOD UPON THE ALTAR, THAT IS, OF LIFE AFTER THE DEATH-PENALTY HAS BEEN PAID, ALSO HELPS TO DEEPEN THE SENSE OF CONSECRATION.** For when the priest by Divine direction, sprinkled the blood of the sacrifice all round about upon the altar, it was to indicate the acceptance on God's part of the life *beyond death*. It indicated that God was satisfied with the substitution, that the penalty had been paid by the death of the victim, and that in consequence the blood, that is, the life—for the life was in the blood (ch. xvii. 11)—could be accepted. Acceptance in and through another was what this portion of the ritual implied, and this is well calculated to deepen the sense of consecration. For, according to the typology, the Person in whom we are accepted is he to whom we ought to be consecrated. It is when we realize that we are accepted in Christ that we feel constrained to dedicate ourselves unto him. The one good turn deserves another, and we are held under a sense of sweetest obligation.

**V. THE CONSECRATION OF THE CHILD OF GOD IS THE COMPLETE SURRENDER OF SELF TO THE OPERATION OF THE HOLY GHOST.** Ewald has most pertinently remarked that among the Greeks and other nations such holocausts as were daily presented by the Jews were rarities. The idea of entire consecration is too broad for a heathen mind. Partial consecration was comparatively easy in idea, but a "surrender without reserve" is the fruit of Divine teaching. Now this is what the burning of the holocaust in the sacred fire of the altar signified. For, since all sensation had ceased before the sacrifice was laid upon the altar, the burning could not suggest the idea to the worshipper of pain or penalty. The fire had come out from God as the token of acceptance (ch. ix. 24). It is, moreover, one of the recognized symbols of the Holy Ghost. Consequently, the exposure of every portion of the sacrifice to the altar fire represented the yielding of the grateful worshipper in his entirety to the operation of God the Holy Ghost. This, after all, is the essence of sanctification. It is the surrender of our whole nature, body, soul, and spirit, to the disposal of the Holy Ghost. This is devotedness indeed. Nowhere has the idea been more felicitously wrought out than in a little posthumous volume of F. R. Havergal's, entitled 'Kept for the Master's Use.' We cannot better convey the idea of the burnt offering than by copying her simple foundation lines upon which she has built her chapters.

"Take my life, and let it be  
Consecrated, Lord, to Thee.  
Take my moments and my days;  
Let them flow in ceaseless praise.  
Take my hands, and let them move  
At the impulse of Thy love.  
Take my feet, and let them be  
Swift, and 'beautiful' for Thee.  
Take my voice, and let me sing  
Always, only, for my king.  
Take my lips, and let them be  
Filled with messages from Thee.  
Take my silver and my gold:  
Not a mite would I withhold.  
Take my intellect, and use  
Every power as Thou shalt choose.  
Take my will and make it Thine:  
It shall be no longer mine.  
Take my heart; it is Thine own:  
It shall be Thy royal throne.

Take my love: My Lord, I pour  
 At Thy feet its treasure-store.  
 Take myself, and I will be  
 Ever, only, ALL for Thee."

R. M. E.

Vers. 1-14.—*The weakness of man and the grace of God.* Measureless is the distance between man and his Maker. And it is sometimes emphasized in such a way as to repress thought and stifle the aspirations of the human breast. In Scripture it is not brought forward as a rayless truth, but is shown to be replete with profit and joy. To consider it increases humility, indeed, but also intensifies gratitude and love. For the less has been blessed by the Greater, and we are permitted to say, looking upon the attributes of the Eternal as exercised towards us in mercy and favour, "This God is our God: we will rejoice in his salvation."

I. **MAN IS IGNORANT: THE GRACE OF GOD IS SEEN IN THE DISTINCT ENUNCIATION OF HIS WILL.** The light of reason, the voice of conscience, the promptings of emotion,—these can inform us only to a slight extent of the worship and service likely to be acceptable to God. Hence the surpassing worth of the full, clear-toned, authoritative utterances of Scripture. That God is Spirit, Light, and Love, that he is holy and almighty, are declarations for which we must be devoutly thankful. The Epicureans pictured the happy gods as dwelling in unruffled serenity far from all cognizance of or interference with the concerns of men. Inspiration removes our suspicions, reassures us with the words, "The eyes of the Lord are over the righteous, and his ears are open unto their prayers." *Errors in the manner of our approach are prevented.* Some would have presumptuously drawn near without the accustomed offering; others might bring unsuitable gifts—human sacrifices, unclean animals, etc. A God less kind might suffer the people to incur the terrible consequences of ignorance, but no! if Nadab and Abihu perish it shall not be for lack of instruction. "Go ye into all the world, teaching them to observe whatsoever things I have commanded you."

II. **MAN IS FEARFUL AND PERTURBED IN THE PRESENCE OF GOD: IT IS GRACIOUSLY ORDAINED THAT SPECIAL MESSENGERS SHALL BE THE APPOINTED CHANNELS OF COMMUNICATION.** "The Lord called unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel." When God appeared on Sinai and thundered out His Law, the terrified people implored that God might not Himself speak again lest they should die. Their entreaty was regarded, and Moses became the medium of conveying the mind of God. Should Jehovah be for ever appearing in person, his visits would be attended with such overwhelming awe that the purport of his words might be in danger of being lost or mistaken. When embarrassed, man's thoughts are dispersed, and memory fails. It was better, therefore, that holy men should speak unto men as moved by the Holy Ghost. The striking instance is the assumption of our nature by the Son of God, putting a veil over the features of Deity that weak sinful mortals might draw near without trembling and admire the gracious words proceeding out of his mouth. Even children hear and understand the words of Jesus. And here we may remark that *the utterances of the messengers must be received as coming from the Most High.* In the appointed place God talked with Moses, and on his repeating the instructions to the Israelites they were bound to attend to them. It is equally incumbent upon us to respect the decrees of God delivered through prophets and apostles, and above all to honour the Father by honouring the Son, believing his words, trusting him as the Teacher sent from God. Preachers are "ambassadors for Christ." We would give thanks without ceasing when hearers receive the truth from our lips, not as the word of men, but the word of God (1 Thess. ii. 13).

III. **MAN IS SINFUL: THE GRACE OF GOD PROVIDES MEDIATORIAL ACCESS TO THE HOLY ONE.** 1. *Sacrifices appointed.* "Bring an offering" without blemish, and place your hand upon its head, to show that it is willingly offered and stands instead of the offerer. And "it shall be accepted to make atonement" for you, to cover your person and works with the robe of mercy and righteousness, so that the Divine gaze may be fastened upon you without displeasure. By the grace of God it was arranged that Jesus Christ should taste death for every man. His was the one offering that, through

accomplishing the will of God, sanctifies all who make mention of his name. Who will hesitate to appear before the Most High? Let faith lay her hand upon the Saviour, rejoicing in the conviction that "while we were yet sinners Christ died for us." 2. *A priesthood.* The Levites were set apart for the service of Jehovah, instead of all the firstborn of Israel. And of the Levites, the sons of Aaron were to minister continually before the Lord, observing all his regulations and maintaining constant purification of themselves, so that without insulting the holiness of God they might interpose between him and his people. Priesthood bridged the chasm between sinful creatures and a pure Creator. The priesthood sanctified the entire nation, which was theoretically a "kingdom of priests." Jesus Christ has concentrated the priestly functions in himself. He has entered into the heaven as our Forerunner, to sprinkle the atoning blood on the altar. And now with true heart in full assurance of faith we may draw nigh to God.

IV. **MAN'S CONDITION VARIES: THE GRACE OF GOD PROVIDES FOR ITS INEQUALITIES.** 1. *Notice is taken of the poor, and appropriate offerings permitted.* Oriental monarchs often despised and rejected the subjects who were unable to enrich their royal coffers. But God is no respecter of persons. It is one of the glories of the gospel that it has been preached to the poor, and is adapted to their needs. God expects every man to come and testify his respect and affection. The poor may bring "turtledoves or young pigeons." The way was thus opened for the parents of him who "became poor for our sakes." It is to be feared that many withhold a contribution because it seems so insignificant. But the Lord is as sorry to see the mite retained in the pocket as the gold which the wealthy refuse to part with. "If there be first a willing mind it is accepted according to that a man hath." Do not decline to engage in Christian work on the plea of defective ability! Surely some fitting department of service can be found. It is often the one talent that is hid in a napkin. 2. *The offering of the poor is pronounced equally acceptable.* Note the repetition of "it is a sacrifice, of a sweet savour unto the Lord" after the 17th verse. It is rather the spirit than the action itself which God regards. Not the results of labour so much as its motives and the proportion of ability to accomplishment.—S. R. A.

Vers. 1-9.—*The greatness of God.* Too wide a field lessens the thoroughness of observation. Hence it is allowable and advantageous to distinguish in thought what is in reality inseparable, in order, by fixing the attention upon certain parts, to acquire a better knowledge of the whole. Such a method recommends itself in dealing with the attributes of God. To attempt to comprehend them all in one glance is, if not impossible, at least of little result in increasing our acquaintance with His character. Let us observe how the hints in this chapter present us with the greatness of God in varied aspects.

I. **THE HOLINESS OF GOD DEMANDS A SACRIFICIAL OFFERING FROM ALL WHO WOULD SEEK HIS FAVOUR.** The offerings here spoken of were spontaneous free-will offerings. They indicated a desire on the part of man to draw nigh to Jehovah, and they also manifested a sense of disturbance wrought by sin in man's relations with his Maker. Once man walked with God in uninterrupted harmony. Then transgression chased innocence away, and shame drove man to hide himself from the presence of God among the trees of the garden. The consciousness of sin renders an offering necessary, under cover of which ("to make atonement for him") we may venture to an audience with the Holy One. Thus can fellowship be resumed. The Antitype of these sacrifices, Jesus Christ, is now our peace. He was "once offered to bear the sins of many." "By one offering he hath for ever perfected them that are sanctified." The old cry, "How shall man be just with God?" is still uttered, and the response comes, "Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus."

II. **THE MAJESTY OF GOD REQUIRES THAT THE REGULATIONS FOR APPROACH WHICH HE HAS APPOINTED BE STRICTLY OBSERVED.** The condescension of God in manifesting himself to the Israelites might be fraught with danger if it led to presumption and to holding in light esteem his awe-inspiring attributes. Instructions are consequently given relating to the minutest details; everything is prescribed. God is pleased with the free-will offering, and it will be accepted if the precepts are adhered to; but it must in no wise be supposed that the sincere expression of affection can excuse wilful

neglect of appointed rules. The love of an inferior for his superior must not prevent the exhibition of due respect. God will be had in reverence by all that are about him. Nor is it open to man arrogantly to pronounce that a consecrated way of access through Jesus Christ may be set aside as unnecessary. Christianity may have broadened the road of approach, but it remains true that there is still an appointed road. To refuse honour to Christ is to treat God with disrespect. "Now is the Son of man glorified, and God is glorified in him." Christless worship, thanksgiving, and prayer, must be shunned.

III. THE HONOUR OF GOD EXPECTS AN OFFERING TO CONSIST OF THE BEST THAT MAN POSSESSES. If poor, a turtle-dove would not be rejected, but for a rich man to offer the same would be treated as an insult to God. And the offering from the herd or flock must be "a male without blemish." Strength and beauty combined are requisite to satisfy the searching eye of the High and Lofty One. We see these requisites embodied in the Lamb of God, the perfect Sacrifice, "holy, harmless, undefiled." He knows little of God who imagines that he will be put off with scanty service, mean oblations. We ought to ask, not what is there can be easily spared, but how much can possibly be laid upon the altar. Let us not mock him by indulging in our own pleasures, and then giving to him the petty remnants of our poverty! Let us strive so to act that the firstfruits of our toil, the chiefest of our possessions, the prime of our life, the best of our days, shall be devoted to purposes of religion! Bestow upon God the deepest thoughts of the mind, the strongest resolutions of the will, the choicest affections of the heart.

IV. THE PERFECTION OF GOD NECESSITATES ORDERLY ARRANGEMENT IN ALL THAT CONCERN HIS WORSHIP AND SERVICE. There is an appointed place for the offering, "the tabernacle of the congregation." The wood must be laid "in order upon the fire" (ver. 7), and the different parts of the victim must likewise be placed "in order upon the wood" (ver. 8).

To constitute a chaos round about the throne is to derogate from the homage a king inspires. It intimates his powerlessness, his want of intelligent forethought and present control. Law reigns everywhere throughout the dominions of Jehovah. The heavenly bodies speak of the symmetry he loves, and plants, animals, and minerals teach the same grand truth. "Order is Heaven's first law." "God is not the author of confusion, but of peace." In the worship of the sanctuary order and decency are of pre-eminent importance. Whatever shocks a devout mind is likely to be offensive to him all whose ways are perfect. Arrangement need not degenerate into formality. The Sunday dress, the preparation for God's house, and the quiet attitude therein, are all important adjuncts to the spiritual education of the young.

Be it observed further that order means *economy of space and time*. Those who have no room nor leisure to be orderly do least and retain least. The laws of God are ever synonymous with the true interests of man.

V. THE PURITY OF GOD OBLIGES THAT THE OFFERING BE CLEANSED FROM DEFILEMENT. Those parts of the victim naturally subject to defilement are to be washed in water, "the inwards and the legs." One might deem this a superfluous proceeding, since they were to be so soon burnt upon the altar. But this would mean an extremely erroneous view of the solemnity of a sacrifice. Those who have not time to serve God properly had better not try it at all. He who counts it a trouble to read and pray has little conception of the insult he offers to God. Before we bow before the Lord to render our tribute of adoration and praise, it were well to purify our hearts, to hallow the desires that may have become impure, to call home our wandering thoughts, and to loose the dusty sandals from the feet which have been treading in the ways of the world. The Almighty desires no part to be absent from the offering. The affections, the strength, the time, the money, that have been lavished on unworthy objects are not in themselves sinful, they are unclean and require the sanctifying influence of the blood of Christ, and the water of the Word, and then they are fit to be rendered unto God and consumed in the fire that testifies his acceptance of the worshipper.—S. R. A.

Ver. 9.—*Our reasonable service.* The burnt offering appears to have been the most general of the sacrifices presented to Jehovah, and to have had the widest significance. Its spiritual counterpart is furnished in Rom. xii. 1. Meditation upon the prophetic symbol will shed light upon the "living sacrifice" of the gospel dispensation.

I. THE NATURE OF THE CHRISTIAN OFFERING AS THUS SYMBOLIZED. 1. *It is a surrender to God of something that belongs to us.* Property inherited and acquired is the material of the sacrifice. Not only what has come to us by natural endowment, but that which is the result of toil—the cattle that were given to us, and the produce we have reared. God demands our hearts, our minds, our talents; and he looks for the devotion to him of any increment that effort may secure. Just as Barnabas sold his land and laid the price at the apostles' feet, and the Apostle Paul commanded that each Corinthian should "lay by him in store as God hath prospered him." 2. *It is a voluntary surrender.* The man "shall put his hand upon the head of the burnt offering," to evince his willingness to part with the animal. All "the cattle on a thousand hills" are really owned by Jehovah, yet does he treat man as proprietor, and does not take by violence the necessary sacrifices for his glory, but leaves it to man freely to recognize his God, and to pay his just dues. "Voluntary" in no wise excludes the force of motives, since every decision has motives, as an antecedent if not as an efficient cause. Freedom implies absence, not of inducements, but of constraint. Man has the power to withhold from the service of God his faculties and possessions. He is ever appealed to in Scripture as a reasonable individual, capable of deciding to what purposes his abilities shall be devoted. "Yield yourselves unto God." 3. *The surrender must be complete.* It was not possible to offer part of a goat or lamb, the victim must be given in its entirety. The blood is sprinkled round about, and "all" the parts are burnt upon the altar. The disciple must follow the Lord fully. No putting of the hand to the plough and looking back. No keeping back part of the price. The believer is bought by Christ, body and soul. The reason why many seem to have offered themselves to God in vain, is because they have done it in a half-hearted way, they have not "sought him with their whole desire."

II. THE MANNER IN WHICH THE OFFERING IS DEVOTED TO GOD. 1. *By the death of the victim.* Death is the total renunciation of present enjoyment—the extremest proof of an intention to set one's self apart for a certain object. If it does not suffice to prove sincerity and entire consecration, then proof is impossible. "All that a man hath will he give for his life." Like the apostle, it behoves Christians to "die daily." At baptism there was the emblem of death to the world. "Old things have passed away." Our death to sin, however, resembles the crucifixion of our Lord, a lingering painful death. We mortify the deeds of the body, crucify the flesh, deny ourselves. "If any man will lose his life he shall save it." 2. *By cleansing water and purifying fire.* "Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth." "Having these promises, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit." "Every one shall be salted with fire." "The trial of your faith which is much more precious than of gold that perisheth, though it be tried with fire." All that is earthly is consumed. The smoke, rising from the material sacrifice, reminds us of the pure metal that is free from dross, and remains to "praise, honour, and glory." Learn to welcome the tribulations of your lot as being the discipline that makes the surrender of yourselves complete. Martyrs have experienced actual flames, the fire may assume another shape to you. Perhaps temptations assail you, and difficulties wear away your strength. Glorify God in the fires. Fire is an emblem of the Holy Spirit, and as Christ offered himself through the Eternal Spirit, so does his Spirit abide with his people, to hallow them, to put away sin, to make them pleasing unto God. 3. *By means of the ordained mediator.* The priest must take the slain animal to perform the necessary rites. Otherwise, however free from fault, the offering will bring loss, not gain, to the offerer. If all believers are now "a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices," they are only "acceptable to God by Jesus Christ." Our Saviour must be our "Daysman," to come between us and God, and present us to his Father. His life, death, and intercession must be the inspiration of our lives, the spring of our hopes, the constraining influence that shall make us dedicate all we have and are to God. "No man cometh unto the Father but by me." We determine to know nothing save Christ and him crucified. "In Christ Jesus" we "are made nigh."

III. THE EFFECT OF THE OFFERING. 1. *It pleases God.* Anthropomorphic expressions are employed, not to degrade the Almighty, but to clarify our conceptions, and to make the truth plain to the dullest eyed. "It is a sweet savour unto the Lord." The smell is repulsive, and cannot be supposed to be grateful in itself to him who is a Spirit.

But it is the disposition to honour and please God that he delights to observe in his children. A parent may admire the rudest sketch if his little one brings it as a token of love, and may esteem the commonest fare a banquet, and ill-dressed food a feast, if regard and affection have contributed to its preparation. The agony and wounds of the Redeemer were not watched by the Father with unmingled delight. As we shudder at the spectacle of the Holy One made a curse for us, and yet rejoice in the all-sufficiency of his burden-bearing; so the Father felt the keenest pangs that rent the breast of his beloved Son, and only joyed in the sublime manifestation of filial devotion, content to endure torture and insult that the blot on his Father's world through the presence of sin might be erased even at such infinite cost. Wherein we are partakers if the sufferings of Christ our Sacrifice is fragrant to the Father. The apostles, in preaching the gospel, became "unto God a sweet savour of Christ." If we walk in love, we cause the incense of love to ascend with sweet odour to heaven (Eph. v. 2). Jesus ministered to the wants of many, and the Philippians, in supplying the necessities of Paul, Christ's servant, were an "odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice well-pleasing unto God." 2. *It procures for the offerer satisfaction of conscience and the favour of God.* The sacrifice is accepted, communion is re-established, sin is covered. There is an inward contentment in all religious acts that is of itself evidence of the reality of religion, and its adaptation to our circumstances. Never did any man abstain from selfish, sinful gratification, or pursue the rugged path of holiness and virtue, without being solaced by the consciousness of having done what was right, what was in harmony with the noblest dictates of his nature. The self-denying, God-serving life is the happiest and most blessed life. Then do we walk in the light of God's countenance, and drink of the river of his pleasures.—S. R. A.

**Vers. 1, 2.—Sacrificature.** The Book of Exodus closes with an account of the entrance of the Shechinah into the tabernacle; with the manner in which that sacred structure was enveloped by the cloud of the Divine presence; also that in which, by rising from the tabernacle, God gave his order for his people to march, and, by resting upon it, to halt and encamp. The Book of Leviticus is concerned with the revelations which God gave to Israel from this habitation of his holiness, in which the laws published from Sinai were amplified (comp. ch. vii. 37, 38). The text lays down broad principles upon the subject of sacrifice, which is considered first in order, because of its great importance to the Levitical system, and to that more glorious system of the gospel which it shadowed forth. We learn that—

**I. SACRIFICATURE HAS GOD FOR ITS AUTHOR.** 1. *It existed before the time of Moses.* (1) Its prevalence amongst the nations argues its origin to be prior to the dispersion (Gen. xi. 9). How else can this fact be explained? (2) We read of it in patriarchal times. The Hebrew patriarchs offered sacrifices (Gen. xii. 7, *et al. freq.*). So did Job, who lived in the land of Uz, on the border-land between Idumea and Arabia, probably about the time of Joseph (Job i. 5; see also Exod. xviii. 12). So did Noah (Gen. viii. 20). (3) The first family had sacrifices which they presented when they appeared before the Shechinah, which flamed between the cherubic emblems set up eastward of Eden (Gen. iv. 3, 4). 2. *It could not have been invented by man.* (1) It was, in the nature of the thing, most unlikely to have occurred to any finite mind. (2) If it did so occur, would God have accepted it? Does he approve will-worship? (see ch. x. 1, 2). What right has a sinner to propose terms of reconciliation to his Maker? His place is to throw himself absolutely upon the Divine mercy, and wait to "hear what God the Lord may speak" (Ps. lxxxv. 7, 8). 3. *Here we have it authorized by God.* (1) "And the Lord called unto Moses" etc. (2) So we find God directing Abraham respecting the manner in which sacrifices should be ordered in his worship (Gen. xv. 9; see also xxii. 2). (3) The "coats of skins" in which our first parents were clothed were presumably from animals offered in sacrifice. Animals were not in those days killed for food (Gen. i. 29; comp. with ix. 3). Since it was "the Lord God" who clothed them, the institution of sacrifice would date from that time, and be a revelation of mercy immediately from him. God is the Author of reconciliation (John iii. 16; Rom. v. 8; 1 John iv. 9).

**II. IT WAS PUBLISHED FROM HIS SANCTUARY.** 1. *There are revelations of God in nature.* (1) These are exhibited in our treatises on Natural Theology. Who can fail

to see the Designer in the works of design? (2) The Scriptures recognize this voice (Ps. ix. 1; xix. 1, etc.; Acts xiv. 17; xvii. 27; Rom. i. 20). 2. *But these are evident only after the hint of them is given.* (1) We have no innate ideas. The Namaquans and other African tribes were found by Moffat, Ridsdale, and other missionaries, without a glimmer of an idea of God or of immortality. (2) The traditions of the Gentiles were originally from a pure source, but became corrupted in transmission. (3) There are no "deists," i.e. natural theologians, where the Bible has not been before them. They do not own the source from whence they derive the hints which guide them in their reasonings. 3. *Sacrificature is not taught in nature.* (1) The book of nature was written too soon. The Creation preceded the Fall. (2) That it is, is not presumed. Sacrificature is excluded from the creed of the deist. (3) This subject belongs to the sanctuary. "And the Lord called Moses and spake *out of the tabernacle* of the congregation," etc. Even the Garden of Eden, where, we presume, it was first instituted, was "planted," and planted to be a temple for Divine worship. (4) Yet without sacrificature there can be no acceptable worship. Cain, the deist, was rejected because he came before God without blood-shedding (see ch. xvii. 11; Heb. ix. 22). Let no man think he acceptably serves God when he neglects the services of the sanctuary under the pretext of "worshipping the God of nature in the fields."

III. THE SACRIFICES APPROVED ARE. "FROM THE HERD AND FROM THE FLOCK." 1. *They are selected from the animals that are clean.* (1) They have the marks of cleanness, viz. parting the hoof and chewing the cud (ch. xi. 3). But all clean creatures were not proper for purposes of sacrifice. Those of the "herd" (*פָּר, baker*) are distinguished as the bull, heifer, bullock, and calf. Those of the "flock" (*בָּקָר, tsan*) as sheep and goats; for this word is used to describe these animals promiscuously (see ver. 10). (2) This reminds us of the purity of God, who can accept nothing that is polluted—"who will in no wise clear the guilty"—who requires purity in his worshippers (Ps. xxiv. 3, 4). (3) It points to the purity of the Great One sacrificed for us, covered in whose righteousness we are justified or accounted as just persons, and in whose atoning blood we are washed and made clean. 2. *They are gregarious creatures.* (1) This feature is prominently noticed here—"herd," "flock." Man is a social being. He is set in families, tribes, nations, and even internationally united. Solitary confinement is amongst the most horrible of punishments. (2) Hence guilt and depravity become hereditary. And as we have been represented to our ruin by our common progenitor, so by the representation of the second Adam we have salvation. (3) Sin is dissociating. Consider its fruits—Hate—variance—strifes—murders. (4) True religion perfects the social principle, centres all union in God. A universe can meet in him. A universe can hold communion in him. The genius of religion is love. The heaven of heavens is love.—J. A. M.

Vers. 3—9.—*The burnt sacrifice of the herd.* Having given general instructions concerning the great business of sacrifice, the Most High descends to particulars, and here describes the burnt sacrifice of the herd. These particulars contain specific directions—

I. AS TO THE QUALITY OF THE VICTIM. 1. *It must be a male.* (1) Females were not only admitted for burnt offerings under the patriarchal dispensation, but upon one memorable occasion even prescribed (see Gen. xv. 9). The ceremonial distinction between male and female was not then, probably, so strongly defined as afterwards it became under the Law. Under the gospel it is abolished (Gal. iii. 28). (2) The male is the stronger animal; and the horns, in the ox, which are symbols of power, are more developed in the male. The male, therefore, would represent the excellence of strength. (3) Thus Christ, as the "Power of God," would be preindicated (1 Cor. i. 24). By his sacrifice of himself he destroyed him that had the power of death, and became the "power of God unto salvation" to every believer (Rom. i. 16; 1 Cor. i. 18). 2. *It must be without blemish.* (1) The rabbins reckon no less than fifty things, any one of which would, in their judgment, render an animal unfit for sacrifice; five in the ear, three in the eyelid, eight in the eye, etc.; but they trifled outrageously. Any obvious defect or redundancy of parts would mar it for sacrifice, and so would any disease by which it might be afflicted. (2) This reminds us that Christ, who is accepted of God as our Sacrifice, is without deficiency or redundancy, weakness or malady (1 Pet. i. 19).

In everything perfect. (3) We are further taught that the best should be given to God. The best thoughts; the best affections; the best gifts; the best service.

II. AS TO THE DUTY OF THE OFFERER. 1. *With a view to procuring the acceptance of his offering.* (1) His gift must be offered freely. "He shall offer it of his own voluntary will." The sacrifice of himself, which Christ offered for us, was voluntary (Gal. i. 4; ii. 20; Eph. v. 25; Titus ii. 6, 14). God expects the homage of the heart (John iv. 23, 24). (2) It must be offered at the *door* of the tabernacle. The altar was at the door. We enter the heavens through the *blood* of Jesus (Heb. x. 19-21). The Jewish sacrifices were never resumed after the destruction of their city and temple, for they held it unlawful to sacrifice anywhere out of Jerusalem. Yet they will not see that the antitypes have come, and that the types are therefore no longer necessary. (3) He must lay his hand upon its head. This action expressed, (a) That the offerer confessed himself a sinner deserving to be sacrificed. (b) That he ceremonially transferred his guilt to a substitute in anticipation of the Great Substitute promised who should truly bear the punishment of sin (1 Pet. ii. 24). (c) That he trusted in the mercy of God through the vicarious sufferings of Messiah (Dan. ix. 26). 2. *With a view to the making an atonement for his sin.* The direction is (1) That he should kill the bullock "before the Lord." The Shechinah was there in the most holy place. The transaction is between the Lord and the soul of the sinner. In all worship we should realize the presence of the Lord. (2) "He shall flay the burnt offering and cut it into his pieces." This operation was here performed, not by the priest, but by the offerer. In the time of the temple this was done by the priests, who were then more numerous and better skilled in the proper mode of doing it. For this service they claimed the skin (ch. vii. 8; 2 Chron. xxix. 34). (3) People and priests alike were concerned in the Great Sacrifice on Calvary. It was done with "wicked hands" (Acts ii. 23).

III. AS TO THE DUTY OF THE PRIESTS. 1. *With respect to the blood.* (1) They were to sprinkle with it round about the altar. The altar upon which Jesus was offered was, in its more restricted sense, the hill of Calvary. On that hill his precious blood was literally sprinkled. (2) The position of the altar is noted, viz. "by the door of the tabernacle of the congregation." In the wider sense the altar on which Jesus suffered was this planet, which is, as it were, the entrance or vestibule of the great temple of the universe, of which the heavens are the holy places (see Heb. iv. 14). 2. *With respect to the water.* (1) Water is one of the great purifiers in the kingdom of nature, and is therefore used as an emblem of the Holy Spirit, the Great Purifier in the kingdom of grace (John vii. 38, 39). So a controversy about baptism with water is described as a "question about purifying" (John iii. 25). (2) With water the priest was to wash the inwards and the legs. The inwards were a type of the soul; and God requires "truth in the inward parts" in the "thoughts and intents of the heart." Every pollution, also, connected with our "walk and conversation" must be laved away. To express this truth Jesus washed his disciples' feet. 3. *With respect to the fire.* (1) It was "put" upon the altar. This does not say that it was kindled by the priest. The fire was of God's own kindling (see ch. ix. 24; x. 1, 2). (2) It was, however, fed with fuel by the priests. Human agency co-operates with Divine even in the most sacred things (Phil. ii. 12, 13). (3) The parts of the sacrifice were laid in order on the wood. The quarters were laid together in their relative positions. So with the head, the fat, and the inwards. Thus the whole animal was consumed. Our whole being should be offered to God in the flames of love (Deut. vi. 5).—J. A. M.

Vers. 10-17.—*The burnt offering of the flock and of the fowls.* The ceremony of the offering of the flock is almost identical with that of the herd described in the verses preceding. In that of the fowls there is a wider dissimilarity.

I. THE VARIETY OF THE VICTIMS CLAIMS ATTENTION. 1. *Five or six kinds of victims were accepted.* (1) These were beeves, sheep, goats, turtle-doves, pigeons. To these may be added the clean birds, supposed to have been sparrows, which were required in the particular ceremony of the cleansing of the leper. (2) All these, excepting the last, were proper for burnt offerings. They are notable as mild, gentle, inoffensive, and useful creatures. They are therefore fittingly used as types to describe the innocence and meekness of Jesus (John i. 36; Isa. liii. 7). (3) As Christians we have nothing to do with the ferocity of the tiger or the rapacity of the wolf. If we have the wisdom

of the serpent, it must be associated with the harmlessness of the dove (see Matt. x. 16). 2. *But what are the lessons conveyed in this variety?* (1) It evinces the insufficiency of the sacrifices of the Law. If one sacrifice or one kind of sacrifice could really take away sin, why repeat it or have recourse to others? Their usefulness therefore was in the manner in which they foreshadowed the better Sacrifice. (2) By contrast it evinces the sufficiency of the Great Sacrifice of the New Testament. No single sacrifice or kind of sacrifice could body forth all that was required in a sufficient Saviour; therefore the number and variety of the types. But Jesus offered himself alone and once, because everything centred in him. Supplementary sacrifices such as that of the Mass, are blasphemous impertinences. (3) It further evinces the mercifulness of Divine justice. Here was the bullock for the rich man. Here was the sheep or goat for the man in moderate circumstances. Here were the turtle-doves or pigeons for the poor (2 Cor. viii. 12). Here is Christ without money and without price for all.

II. THERE ARE NOTABLE OMISSIONS. 1. *The placing of the offerer's hand upon the head of the victim.* (1) This is mentioned in connection with the offering from the herd (ver. 4). Omitted in the description of the offering from the flock. Also from the offering from the fowls. It may have been done nevertheless. (2) It was very expressive of the transfer of sin to the victim. Possibly Paul refers to this custom—of course, taking it in its application to the gospel—when he speaks of the “laying on of hands” as amongst the “first principles of the doctrine of Christ” (Heb. vi. 2). (3) If in any case it was omitted, it would then suggest the important truth that the *hand of God* laid upon Christ the iniquity of us all (Isa. liii. 6, 10). 2. *The flaying of the skin.* (1) This is described in the account of the herd, but omitted in that of the flock (ver. 6). It appears, nevertheless, to have been done also in the latter case. (2) The skin is the natural clothing or covering of the animal. If the coats of skins with which God clothed Adam and Eve in substitution for their covering of fig leaves by which they expressed their sense of shame for their sin, were those of sacrificed animals, then it vigorously sets forth the manner in which we receive “beauty for ashes” when invested with the righteousness of Christ. 3. *Instead of the “door of the tabernacle of the congregation” which is mentioned in connection with the herd, “northward” is the term used in connection with the flock* (comp. vers. 5, 11). These expressions are generally synonymous (ch. vii. 2). Standing at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, the worshipper held communion with God and with the whole congregation. He stood at the north side of the altar, because that was the place of rings to which the victims were fastened in order to be slain. The hill of Calvary also was situate north-west of Jerusalem. How humiliating that our communion with God and his Church must be through *suffering and blood!*

III. DIFFERENCES ARE NOTICEABLE IN THE BURNT SACRIFICE OF FOWLS. 1. *In this case two birds were brought.* (1) One, however, only is offered as a burnt sacrifice. The singular is used in this description. (2) The other was to be used as a sin offering (see ch. v. 7; xii. 8; xiv. 22). 2. *They were cloven but not divided.* (1) This was in accordance with the directions given to Abraham (Gen. xv. 10). (2) The cleaving was required for the removal of the intestines, but the wings must not be divided, for the power for flight of Christ to heaven cannot be impaired (Acts ii. 24). (3) The head was wrung off, and the blood wrung out by the side of the altar. 3. *The crop and feathers were cast into the place of ashes.* (1) This was during the tabernacle “by the side of the altar on the east part.” All the ashes went there (see ch. vi. 10). (2) In the temple the place of ashes was a closet under the altar. In allusion to this the souls, that is to say, the bodies, of the martyrs are represented as under the altar, crying for vengeance upon their persecutors (Rev. vi. 9-11). Reflect: The poor man's pigeons as truly as the rich man's bullock was “of a sweet savour unto the Lord” (see Eph. v. 2; also 1 Pet. ii. 5).—J. A. M.

Vers. 1, 2.—*God in special manifestation.* Always and everywhere God has been revealing himself. There is no time when, no place where, men might not have “seen him who is invisible.” Nowhere has he left himself without witness (Acts xiv. 17). Always might “his eternal power and Godhead have been understood” (Rom. i. 20). But the eyes of man were blinded, and his “foolish heart was darkened,” so that by his own wisdom he knew not God. It is certain that he would have

remained in ignorance but for those *special manifestations* of which the sacred Scriptures are the record. The text reminds us that these include—

I. **HIS PECULIAR PEOPLE.** Out of the human race God chose one people, “the congregation,” “the children of Israel,” to whom he would appear, by whom the knowledge of his nature and will should be retained, and through whom he should be made known to others. To this congregation “were committed the oracles of God;” and while surrounding nations were stumbling in the darkness, Israel was walking in the light of the Lord.

II. **HIS OWN HOUSE.** “God spake out of the tabernacle,” etc. This his dwelling-place in Israel had just been constructed, and there, in the most holy place, he had signified his presence by the glory-cloud. That was none other than the house of God, his abode in the midst of the congregation.

III. **HIS CHOSEN MINISTER.** “The Lord called unto Moses.” The experiences of Sinai had shown that there was need of mediation between the Majesty of heaven and the children of earth. God, therefore, chose to reveal his mind through the one man who was fittest for close access, and who would calmly receive and faithfully announce his will—the courageous, devoted, magnanimous Moses.

IV. **HIS PARTICULAR DIRECTIONS.** “Speak . . . and say . . .” Then follow the instructions of this book of the Law: particular and precise regulations, by attention to which the congregation might worship with acceptance and “live in holiness and righteousness before God.”

In the dispensation in which we now stand we have analogous special manifestations. 1. *The Church of Christ* is now the congregation of the Lord, the “Israel of God;” not the members of any visible organization, but all those of every society who love and honour Christ, “both theirs and ours.” To such “he manifests himself as he does not unto the world;” in them his Holy Spirit dwells; through them he works on the world without. 2. *The Christian sanctuary* is now the house of the Lord, the “place of his abode.” There he makes his presence felt; there he causes us to behold his glory, the beauties of his character, the glories of his grace. At the table of the Lord, more especially, the risen Master meets with his true disciples, the Divine Host with his human friends and guests, to receive and return their love, to accept their vows, to impart his benediction and his blessing. 3. *The Christian ministry* is now the chosen channel of his communications. Not necessarily those ordained with human hands; these if sent by God, but only if sent of him; and beside these, all whose hearts he has touched (1 Sam. x. 26), whose minds he has filled with spiritual understanding (Col. i. 9), and whose lips he has opened (Ps. li. 15); all those on whose soul there really rests the “burden of the Lord.” 4. *The New Testament* now contains the Divine instructions. These are (1) few in number; (2) moral and spiritual rather than formal and mechanical in their nature; (3) adequate to penetrate to the deepest springs of the soul, and to cover the widest particulars of the life.

It becomes us, in view of these special manifestations of God in Christ, (a) to associate ourselves immediately with the recognized people of God; (b) to seek, constantly and sedulously, his face and favour and the knowledge of his will, in his house; (c) to hold ourselves ready to speak for him to others or to receive his message from others, as his Spirit shall prompt us or them; (d) to master and foster those principles of righteousness which Christ has taught us, that we may cultivate our character and regulate our lives according to his holy will.—C.

**Vers. 2—17.—*The true end of sacrifice,—entire consecration to God.*** We shall reach the end for which God introduced all that apparatus of Divine worship so elaborately described in this book if we take the following steps:—

I. **THE SEPARATING PRESENCE OF SIN IN THE HEART AND LIFE OF MAN.** But for the sin which “separates between us and our God” there would have been unrestrained communion between man and his Maker in every age and land: no need of mediation, of special arrangements, of careful limitations, of means and media of approach. Every line of this chapter, as also of this book, speaks of sin—sin in the soul, sin in the life, sin on the conscience, sin as a hindrance in the way of man.

II. **THE EFFORT OF MAN TO FIND A WAY BACK TO GOD.** It is impossible to forget that while Israel was offering its sacrifices as God directed, other nations were bringing

their victims in such ways as they deemed best. The commonness of sacrifice, its prevalence outside the holy nation, speaks eloquently enough of man's conscious distance from God, and of his desire and endeavour to find a way back to his favour. "Wherewith shall I come before the Lord?" This is the anxious question of sin-stricken, unenlightened man. "Shall I come with burnt offerings . . . will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams?" This is his suggestion in reply. It is affecting to think of the multitudes of sacrifices under every sky, as instances of men "feeling after" the mercy of an offended God, groping in the dimness or the darkness towards reconciliation and peace.

III. THE DIVINE PROVISION FOR MAN'S RETURN AND ACCESS TO HIMSELF. 1. *Under the old dispensation.* Man was to bring to the altar of God suitable offerings; such as were within his reach; the best of the kind; an unblemished male. It might be from his herd (ver. 2), or from his flock (ver. 10), or it might be a fowl of the air (ver. 14). The priest was to pour the blood round about the altar (vers. 5, 11), and the carcase was to be consumed upon the altar,—a whole burnt offering unto the Lord. 2. *Under the new dispensation.* Instead of "the blood of bulls and goats," God has provided one offering which suffices for all souls of every land and age, even his own beloved Son. This was the "Lamb of God" (1), absolutely perfect, "without blemish and without spot" (1 Pet. i. 19; Heb. ix. 14); (2) shedding his own blood (Heb. ix. 12), giving "his soul (his life) an offering for sin" (Isa. liii. 10); "putting away sin by the sacrifice of himself" (Heb. ix. 26); (3) accepted of God; "an offering . . . of a sweet savour unto the Lord" (ver. 17; Eph. v. 2). Through that shed blood of "the Lamb that was slain" for us we have access at all times, forgiveness of sin, reconciliation to God. But not without

IV. PERSONAL SPIRITUAL PARTICIPATION. The offerer under the Law took personal part in the offering: he brought his victim to the tabernacle (ver. 10); he killed it with his own hands (vers. 5, 11); he also "put his hands upon the head" of the animal (ver. 4). The sinner, under the gospel, does not provide the sacrifice: "Christ our passover is slain for us." But he does take a personal participation: "by faith he lays his hand on that dear head of his;" he acknowledges that he himself is worthy of death; believes and appropriates to his own need the fact that Jesus died for his sin; earnestly desires that his guilt may be transferred to the Lamb of God; entreats that that shed blood of his may atone for and cover his iniquity.

V. THE END OF SACRIFICE,—ENTIRE PERSONAL CONSECRATION. The consumption of the whole animal in the fire pictures the complete dedication of the Saviour, his absolute and entire consecration to the work which the Father gave him to do. It symbolizes ours also. Accepted by God through the atoning blood of the Lamb, we are to dedicate ourselves to him. Our personal consecration 1. Should follow upon and grow out of our acceptance through a crucified Saviour. 2. Should be thorough and complete: including heart and life, body and spirit, things sacred and things secular. 3. Will then be well pleasing to God, "an offering of a sweet savour unto the Lord" (ver. 17).—C.

Vers. 2-17.—*Principles of spiritual sacrifice.* All who know God are engaged, frequently, if not continually, in sacrificing unto him. Here are principles of sacrifice by which we may be guided.

I. THAT GOD DESIRES AND DEMANDS THE BEST WE CAN BRING. If the offering were of the herd, it was to be a "male without blemish" (ver. 3); so also if of the flock (ver. 10). Not that which was of small account and could be well spared, but the worthiest and best. *The best for the Highest.* Not "that which costs us nothing" (2 Sam. xxiv. 24) for him who has given us everything; rather the costliest of our treasures for him who, "though he was rich, for our sakes became poor." We may well break the rarest alabaster for him whose "body was broken" for our sin; may well pour out the most precious spikenard for him who poured out his life-blood for our redemption. "Worthy is the Lamb to receive riches" (Rev. v. 12). When we worship him, or work for him, or give to his cause, we should bring, not our exhaustion, but our vigour; not our languor, but our energy; not costless effort, but that which has taken time and trouble to produce—the gold rather than the silver, the silver rather than the pence; not anything that will pass in the sight of man, but the very best we can bring to his presence.

**II. THAT GOD ACCEPTS THE BEST WE ARE ABLE TO BRING.** If he could not afford a bullock, the Hebrew worshipper might bring a sheep; or if that were beyond his means, a turtle-dove or pigeon (vers. 2, 10, 14). God accepts gifts "according to that a man hath," etc. (2 Cor. viii. 12). He who approved the widow's mites more than the rich men's gold still "sits over against the treasury," and accepts what we can bring, however humble it be, if we bring with it "the willing mind." In the balances of heaven a conversation in a garret by the bedside of a pauper may weigh more than the greatest sermon before the noblest audience.

**III. THAT GOD REQUIRES THE FULL CONSENT OF OUR OWN MIND.** "He shall offer it of his own voluntary will" (ver. 3). The excellency, the beauty, the acceptableness of our offering lies largely in the hearty good will with which we bring it. "The Lord loveth a cheerful giver" (2 Cor. ix. 7). (See 1 Chron. xxix. 6, 9.)

**IV. THAT OUR OFFERING MUST BE MADE CONSCIOUSLY UNTO THE LORD.** He shall offer it "before the Lord" (ver. 3); he shall kill it "before the Lord" (ver. 11). When the victim was slain the offerer was to have in his mind the presence of God, and was to present it consciously to him. Whatever form our sacrifice may take—prayer, praise, inquiry of the Lord, contribution, exhortation—it must be not mechanical, but spiritual; it must be religious; it must be rendered "as to the Lord, and not unto men."

**V. THAT GOD DESIRES OBEDIENCE IN THINGS BEYOND OUR UNDERSTANDING.** Doubtless the priests of the tabernacle failed to see the import of many of the Divine directions. The people also must have been at a loss to understand the reason of many details of the service (vers. 6, 8, 11, 15, 17). But both priests and people were required to conform under penalty of severe displeasure. In many things unintelligible to them do our children and the uninstructed conform, because they rightly trust to those who are older and wiser. There are many things concerning which we have all to feel ourselves to be the little children we really are in the presence of the heavenly Father, and we must do unquestioningly what he bids us. Let us try strenuously to understand, and when we fail to reach the Divine meaning, trustfully conform.

**VI. THAT THERE CAN BE NO WASTE IN THE FULLEST SACRIFICE WE LAY ON HIS ALTAR.** In the burnt offering the whole victim was consumed; no part was saved for food. "To what purpose is this waste?" is it asked? We reply: 1. That the God in whom we live and whose we are is worthy of everything we can offer him. 2. That we never so truly realize the end and reach the height of our manhood as when we are devoting ourselves to God. 3. That we may count on a large and generous response at his liberal hand. 4. That we gain in spiritual profit far more than we lose in material reduction.—C.

Ver. 17 (latter part).—*God's pleasure in man.* We believe—

**I. THAT GOD IS A BEING OF SUPREME BLESSEDNESS.** He is the ever-blessed God, the source and fountain of all joy. He who gives such boundless bliss to his creation must be divinely blessed. He could not give what he has not in himself.

**II. THAT SOME PART OF HIS JOY HE FINDS IN MAN.** What constitutes the happiness of the Supreme? "The Lord will rejoice in his works;" but it is a larger truth that "the Lord taketh pleasure in his people" (Ps. cxlii. 4); that "the Lord's portion is his people" (Deut. xxxii. 9).

**III. THAT HIS GOOD PLEASURE IN US IS IN—**

1. Our complete but conscious consecration of ourselves. The "offering made by fire" was "of a sweet savour unto the Lord," not as typifying the annihilation of our self, absolute absorption of self in God (the Hindoo theory), but as expressing the offerer's desire to dedicate himself and all that he had to God,—voluntary, conscious devotion.

2. Our self-surrender to his Son our Saviour. That which, above all else, God says to us now is, "This is my beloved Son: hear ye him;" and the initial, essential, decisive step for us to take, in order to give him pleasure, is to "receive," to "believe in," to accept Jesus Christ as Teacher, Saviour, Lord, and Friend.

3. Our conformity to his revealed will, by (1) reverence (Ps. cxlvii. 11); (2) holy confidence in his pardoning love (Ps. cxlvii. 11); (3) patient endurance of wrong (1 Pet. ii. 20); (4) generous service of others (Phil. iv. 18; Heb. xiii. 16).—C.

The first part of this book, which may be called the spiritual statute-book of Israel

as the congregation of the Lord, is occupied with *the laws of sacrifice*, chs. i.—vii. The underlying fact is that of sin as separation from God; but the book, as regulating the intercourse between the sinful people and the holy object of their worship, is itself a constituent part of the gracious covenant made with Israel. While it deepens the sense of sin, it provides the means of reconciliation and sanctification, and therefore the laws prescribed, while, as laws, restraining liberty and giving form to religious acts, at the same time embody in themselves the grace of God in the covenant relation between Jehovah and his people.

Vera. 1-17.—*Law of the burnt offerings.* The object of worship, place, worshipper, offering, are all clearly set forth. The way of obedience made plain.

Ver. 1.—“*And the Lord called unto Moses, and spake unto him out of the tabernacle of the congregation.*” This is the foundation on which the whole of positive religion is built up, the *Divine voice* speaking through a *mediator*, at an *appointed place*, and in a distinct, *authoritative manner*. Notice—

I. **THE DIVINE VOICE.** “The Lord,” Jehovah, that is, the God of *revelation* and *covenant*. 1. The beginning of all true religion is the *gracious manifestation of God*. It is a very different spiritual structure which is built upon this foundation from that which is raised on men’s own thoughts. Compare the corruptions of traditional religions, heathenism, with the Old Testament revelation; the vague and doubtful attempts of religious philosophy to provide an object of supreme reverence. The name *Jehovah* betokened a progress in special revelation. The *Eloistic* worship of the earliest ages, while resting, no doubt, on direct communications of God’s Spirit, without which there can be no living intercourse between the creature and the Creator, was elementary in its character, suited to the childhood of the world—God revealed first as the God of creation, the object of reverential obedience in the sphere of natural life and the simplest laws of righteousness. As the relations of mankind to one another grew more numerous and complicated, the idea of religion enlarged; the object of worship was the God of a people, the God of families, the God whose name was distinctly named, as distinctly as the people’s, between whom and a certain portion of mankind there was a direct covenant, involving gracious vouchsafements on one side, and faithful service on the other. This is the connection between the Book of Exodus and that of Leviticus, which the very opening words remind us is very close. In the former book we are in the presence of Jehovah. In this we are listening to his voice, a voice which speaks clearly and fully what are the ordinances of his will. 2. *The invitation and summons.* “*The Lord called unto Moses.*” We must notice here the two elements of law and grace combined, which is the very essence of the book. All the regulations of the Mosaic economy were based upon the fact that Jehovah was in close fellowship with his people. Just as a made road brings the points between which it lies nearer, by opening the means of intercourse, so sacrifices were a token of covenant relation, and a perpetual *call* of Jehovah to his people to approach him. *The Lord called* that he might bestow his special grace on those who obeyed his call. He called with the voice of command and authority, that his people might henceforth know fully and without possibility of mistake what they had to do. So still there is a gracious call of the gospel, which invites freely and universally, but it is at the same time the proclamation of a new law of righteousness, as in the Sermon on the Mount, and in the whole revelation of duty in the Christian Church. Notice—

II. **THE FACT OF MEDIATION.** “*The Lord called unto Moses, and spake unto him.*” “*The Law was given by Moses.*” “*It was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator,*” through the instrumentality of an appointed servant, who should be between Jehovah and his people. Moses united in himself remarkably the three elements of the office—the *prophetic*, as echoing the voice of God; the *priestly*, as the medium of offered service; the *kingly*, as the legislator and ruler, both proclaiming and administrating the Divine Law. We see also represented in the case of Moses the union of the two qualifications for the fulfilment of the office of mediator—the *personal merit* and the *Divine appointment*. Moses stood apart from the people in his character and personal eminence. He was anointed to his office, and manifestly favoured of God with special communications. In all these respects he is the type of the perfect Mediator. Jesus Christ was *in himself* able to be between God and man. His mediation is fact, history.

III. **THE FACT OF MEDIATION WAS BASED UPON THE FACT OF COVENANT,** THE

**RELATION BETWEEN THE PEOPLE AND JEHOVAH, THE GOD OF REVELATION, MUTUAL PLEDGE, AND PROMISE.** The whole structure of the ceremonial law was built up on reciprocal obligation. Living intercourse between God and man is the spiritual reality which binds together all the details of this book of the Law. A development, therefore, of the first and greatest commandment, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God," etc. The acceptableness of religious worship lies in the fellowship of love.

**IV. THE PLACE OF MEETING BETWEEN GOD AND MAN.** "*Out of the tabernacle of the congregation,*" or "the tent of meeting." A temporary provision, afterwards superseded by a more permanent and elaborate structure, but in its external features betokening the dispensational character of the Law. The central fact was a gracious manifestation of God, a meeting-place inviting to intercourse, an appointed form of worship, the stepping-stone to a higher communion. "God dwelleth not in temples made with hands." The tabernacle was subsequent to the covenant. The life of fellowship preceded the act of fellowship. The people are God's before they receive the Law. There are three elements in the *tabernacle*, representative of universal and abiding truth. 1. *The Lord speaks out of it.* Positive revelation the foundation of positive religion. The soul waits upon God. Gracious messages the beginning of divine work in and for man. There were gropings of natural religion worth nothing in themselves. The Spirit of God calls the spirit of man to a higher life. The true faith rests on the Word, honours the ordinances, seeks the place where God speaks in the most distinct and emphatic manner. This finds illustration both individually and in the history of God's people. 2. *Tabernacle of the congregation.* Fellowship an essential fact of the religious life. Man a moral being, only as he is in society. As it is the *fruit* of religion, so it is the *seed* from which springs the true life, both of nations and individuals. The tabernacle or temple the centre of the Hebrew national existence. The tent of meeting also the palace-chamber of the Great King. Jehovah's throne amongst his people the true source of all power and centre of all authority. All places of worship, as meeting-places of the congregation or Church, witness to the presence of Jehovah, of Jesus Christ, the Lord, in the midst of his people, and to the kingdom of God in the world. No doctrine of the Church consistent with this fact of Jehovah speaking out of the tabernacle of the congregation but that which recognizes the position of all believers as the same. "Where two or three are gathered together," etc. 3. *The place of meeting was both the centre to which offerings were brought and from which blessings were taken.* A true religion must embrace both the passive and the active elements—*Mind, heart, will.* Christianity did not abolish sacrifice and offerings, lifted up the lower into the higher, the local and temporary into the universal and perpetual. No material edifice, no priestly caste, no mere prescription of rites, can limit religious service. The temple of the Jews was destroyed, but in place of it we possess the risen glory of Christ, the spiritual presence of the Living One, the communion of saints, the ceaseless offering up of spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ. The Law which was given on the mount from the lips of Jesus requires a higher righteousness than the righteousness of legalists.—R.

**Ver. 2.—"Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, If any man of you bring an offering unto the Lord, ye shall bring your offering of the cattle, even of the herd, and of the flock."** Here is the great fundamental principle, as it were the *pre-amble* of the law of offerings. Notice—

**I. THE DIVINE LAW IS UNIVERSAL.** "*Any man of you.*" No respect of persons with God. Same law to rich and poor, wise and unwise, as to its essential requirements. These *private offerings* represented personal religion. There may be differences of official duty, but what we bring to God for ourselves must be without respect to anything but the real relation between our soul and God.

**II. ALL OFFERINGS MUST BE VOLUNTARY.** No compulsion with God but the compulsion of heart and conscience. True worship is not a mere objective obedience. "*If any man bring an offering.*" It is brought by a willing mind, not out of caprice, not to any place or to any God, but with intelligent acceptance of the will of God as coincident with our own will. When we bring offerings we should know what it is in our hearts to bring, not trust to the impulse of the moment or the variations of fluctuating feelings.

III. THE ESSENTIAL CHARACTERISTIC OF THE OFFERING IS SURRENDER, ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF THE LORD'S CLAIM OVER US. "*Out of the herd or flock.*" That is, out of our own possessions, valued, known, intimately associated with ourselves. A religion which costs us nothing cannot be real. The more of one's self there is in it, the more really offered it is. The mistake of all ritualism is that it leads us to offer up another's offering instead of our own. We observe the rite, we repeat by rote the words, we listen to the music, but is the offering out of our own herd or flock? Jesus will have no disciple who does not first count the cost.

IV. WHILE THE OFFERING IS VOLUNTARY, IT IS STILL PRESCRIBED. "*Ye shall bring your offering of the cattle.*" An enlightened recognition of Divine commandments is necessary to acceptable worship. "Faith cometh by hearing, hearing by the Word of God." "Not every man that saith, Lord, Lord; . . . but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven"—"*the things that I say.*" The liberty of the gospel is not licence. The doctrines, rules, and practical teachings found generally in the New Testament, though not systematized there, are yet positively given. While we are delivered from the bondage of a legal dispensation, we are yet under law to Christ. Will-worship is unchristian. Tendency of our time is to an individualism which is dangerous. The study of the Old Testament in the light of the New a wholesome antidote. Yet our faith must always work by love (*vide Gal. v.*).—R.

Ver. 3.—*The burnt sacrifice.* The most ancient, that which represents all others.  
Notice—

I. THE MAIN PRINCIPLE REPRESENTED—SELF-SURRENDER IN ORDER TO SELF-PRESERVATION THROUGH THE COVENANTED MERCY OF JEHOVAH. In this principle there are included these points: 1. Recognition of the *supreme claim of God.* 2. *Substitutionary surrender*, a life for a life, the victim for the offerer. 3. *Expiation of sin and acceptance*, by the restoration of the covenant relations between God and man, proceeding from Divine love, but resting on the offering as representing a fulfilment on both sides of the contract—God forgiving, man obeying. 4. The union of the two elements of blood and fire, *i.e.* of atonement and purification, the negative holiness and the positive holiness, justification and sanctification, fulness of grace.

II. DETAILS OF THE SACRIFICE. Ver. 3.—"*Of the herd, . . . a male without blemish.*" God must have our best. We must make our religious service a reality, putting into it our strongest faculties, best opportunities, counting all things but loss for Christ. Examples in the offerings of great faith. Nothing should be blemished in the house of God, in private religion, in acts of charity. "*Thou God seest me.*" "*Of his own voluntary will.*" Although a law, it is of no validity but as an appeal to the free heart of man. Anticipation of the gospel, the Law a schoolmaster to bring us to Christ. The highest state of life is when law is absorbed in the activity of the nature; we are likest God when we are by grace a law unto ourselves, "*willing to do his will.*" "*At the door of the tabernacle of the congregation before the Lord.*" Here are the three elements of religion recognized: 1. *Publicity.* 2. *Fellowship.* 3. *Divine order.* Secret religion is a contradiction. The profession is part of the sacrifice. "*Thy vows are upon me, O Lord.*" The congregation is a cloud of witnesses, both sustaining personal religion and supplying a constant test of sincerity. And whatever we do, we do before the Lord. His face we desire to seek, and in the light of his manifested favour we rejoice. There are special appointments which all true worshippers will honour: the sabbath, the Word, the congregation, the ordered life of the Christian Church.—R.

Ver. 4.—"*And he shall put his hand upon the head of the burnt offering; and it shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him.*" A most significant commandment, full of gracious meaning for those who observed it.

I. ALL ATONEMENT RESTS UPON FREE GRACE. "*Accepted for him to make atonement.*" God *sets forth* the propitiation, declares *his* righteousness for the remission of sins. It shall be accepted, not because it is in itself an equivalent, but because a merciful Father accepts it.

II. THE VICTIM ACCEPTED PROCLAIMS THE CONDITIONAL NATURE OF THE GRACE. It is free as being unmerited, and yet it is the expression of a loving will, and comes forth from an infinite nature. God forgives because he chooses to forgive, yet he forgives by the method which he proclaims. The lower sacrifice points to the higher.

III. THE OFFERER'S FAITH IS AS TRULY NEEDFUL AS THE VICTIM HE BRINGS. "Without faith it is impossible to please God." The hand put upon the head of the victim signified the identification of the offerer and offered. Whether the confession of sins was included or not is of little importance. Faith is self-surrender. In all atonement there are three parties represented—the offender, the offended, the mediator. The hand of the offender sets forth his whole activity and conscious self. His connection with the victim is itself confession of sin and acceptance of the covenanted mercy of Jehovah. We lay our hand on the head of Jesus by the spiritual identification which includes the application of the mind to his truth, the yielding of the heart to his love, and the consecration of the life to his service.—R.

Vers. 5—9.—*The killing, slaying, and consuming of the victim.* Full, throughout, of the idea of atonement. The three main elements are—I. The *blood*. II. The *fire*. III. The *sweet savour* unto the Lord. Consider—

I. THE SPRINKLED BLOOD. The *offerer* killed the victim. The *priests* received the blood and sprinkled it upon the altar. The two chief elements of atonement were thus united—the human and the Divine. Atonement is reconciliation on the ground of a restored covenant through sacrifice. The blood *shed* represented the fact of life for life offered by faith. The blood *sprinkled* by priests, represented the Divine offer of mercy through an appointed mediation, at the place and time prescribed by God's gracious will. His will is our sanctification. The sacrifice of Christ is an outcome of Divine love received on behalf of the sinner as being offered by him in believing surrender to God and renewal of the covenant.

II. THE FIRE. The offering flayed and cut in pieces. Fire and wood placed by the priests on the altar, etc. All these details belong to the one fact that the offering is not only presented, but consumed, and consumed in pieces. The idea is that of the mingling together of the will of Jehovah with the offered obedience of his creature. A representation of the promised sanctifying grace which renews the whole man, gradually, but with comprehensive application of the Spirit of God to every part of the being and character. The ablution would convey the idea of the washing of regeneration. All which is specially significant of life and activity, "*the inwards and the legs*," is washed in water before placed on the altar. The whole is then termed, "*a burnt sacrifice, an offering made by fire*." The fire represented at the same time purification and destruction. As applied in the name of God, it promised his bestowment of the supernatural power which should at once destroy the evil and renew the good. Hence the gift of the Holy Spirit was symbolized by fire. We must be wholly offered, we must be penetrated and pervaded by the Spirit. The application of the *fire* is not only in a *first* baptism of the Spirit, but in the sanctifying work of *life*, in which oftentimes consuming dispensations are required, which, while they burn up, do also renew and recreate. Are we yielding up *all* to this gracious process on God's altar?

III. THE SWEET SAVOUR UNTO THE LORD. Fragrant ascent of man's offering. Nothing is said of the addition of incense, therefore the mere smoke and steam of the offering itself is described as "*sweet savour*." The obedience of faith is acceptable to the Lord. Nothing can more decidedly set forth the freeness and fulness of pardon and reconciliation. The Divine will is entirely reunited with the human will. Thus every sacrifice pointed to the end of sacrifices. When it is offered, when the fire has done its work, there is peace with God. So the Lord Jesus, anticipating the conclusion of his sufferings and his return to heaven, exclaimed, "The hour is come, glorify thy Son." "I have glorified thee on the earth. I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do." Resting on that finished sacrifice, we can rejoice in our obedience as a sweet savour to the Lord, notwithstanding that in itself it is necessarily consumed by the perfect righteousness of the Divine Law. The blood and fire of the cross of Calvary are already upon the altar. We are able in the resurrection and ascension to behold the manifest tokens of acceptance. The fragrance of the Saviour's risen glory and eternal righteousness are not only before God, well pleasing to him, but are also ours by faith, mingling with the imperfection of a fallen humanity, and lifting it up to angelic life and spotless purity and joy in the presence of God.—R.

Vers. 10—13.—*The offering from the flocks.* Sheep or goat. This is a repetition of

the same law as applied to the offering of lower value. The great spiritual fact is thus set forth that God is no respecter of persons. His Law applies to all sorts and conditions of men, and his grace is coextensive with his Law. The rich man's offering and the poor man's substantially the same. The only unchangeable condition is the relation of the offering to the offerer. It must represent sincere, heartfelt surrender to God. It must not be a wild animal caught for the purpose, but that which, having been associated with the personality and life, represents both the man himself and his house and family. Hence in the early Church, baptism was a consecration both of the individual and of his household, an offering of all to the Lord. Many applications of this idea. All can give something. Religion sanctifies the world through the sanctification of souls. The Spirit creates afresh the inner man, then all follows.—R.

**Vera. 14—17.**—*The offering of fowls—turtle-doves or young pigeons.* The great abundance of these birds in the East would make the provision one which was easy even for the poorest to fulfil. How gracious this appointment! God is no “hard master.” He delights not in mere burdensome sacrifice—no costliness, suffering, or privation has merit with him. He demands the willing obedience of the heart. He asks for that which really represents a surrender of self. All these minute regulations were simply intended to develop the principle of voluntary obedience. There was the same subdivision in the case of the bird as in the case of the quadruped, to remind the very poorest and humblest offerer that he must not shelter himself in the insignificance of his offering from the obligations which it represented. The application of fire to the second bird denoted the application of the righteousness of God to the life of the offerer, and while it was as a prescribed offering a promise of acceptance, and therefore of renewing grace and spiritual restoration, it was on the part of the offerer the pledge and promise of an entire obedience in which body, soul, and spirit, all the life and all the possessions, should be consecrated to God.—R.

#### EXPOSITION.

#### CHAPTER II.

**THE MEAT OFFERING.** The regulation of the burnt offering as a Levitical institution is immediately followed by a similar regulation of the meat offering, consisting of flour and oil, with salt and frankincense, and usually accompanied by the drink offering of wine. The sacrifice of the animal in the burnt offering had represented the entire surrender of the offerer's will and life to God; the presentation of the fruits and products of the earth in the meat offering represents man's gift of homage, whereby he acknowledges God's sovereignty over all things and over himself, by offering to him a portion of that which he had graciously bestowed in abundance. David's words, “All things come of thee, and of thine own have we given thee . . . all this store cometh of thine hand, and is all thine own” (1 Chron. xxix. 14, 16), express the idea underlying the meat offering. In the acted language of symbolism, it not only recognized the supremacy of God, but made a tender of loyal submission on the part of the offerer; as gifts

of homage did in the case of Jacob and Esau (Gen. xxxii. 20), and as they do to this day throughout our Indian empire, and generally in the East.

**Ver. 1.**—*And when any will offer a meat offering unto the Lord.* The word used in the original for “meat offering” (*minchah*), means, like its Greek equivalent, *δέσπορ*, a gift made by an inferior to a superior. Thus the sacrifices of Cain and Abel were their “minchah” to God (Gen. iv. 3, 4), the present sent to Esau by Jacob was his “minchah” (Gen. xxxii. 13), and the present to Joseph was his brethren's “minchah” (Gen. xlivi. 11). It is therefore equivalent to a gift of homage, which recognizes the superiority of him to whom it is offered, and ceremonially promises loyal obedience to him. Owing to its use in this passage, it came gradually to be confined in its signification to vegetable gifts,—unbloody sacrifices, as they are called sometimes, in contrast to animal sacrifices—while the word “corban” came to be used in the wider acceptation which once belonged to “minchah.” The conditions to be fulfilled by the Israelite who offered a meat offering were the following. 1. He must offer either (1) uncooked flour, with oil, salt, and frankincense, or (2) flour made into an unleavened cake (whether of the nature of biscuit or

pancake), with oil, salt, and frankincense; or (3) roasted grains, with oil, salt, and frankincense. 2. He must bring his offering to the court of the tabernacle, and give to the priests at least as much as one omer (that is, nearly a gallon), and not more than sixty-one omers. The priest receiving it from him must: 1. Take a handful of the flour, oil, and salt, or a proportionate part of the cake (each omer generally made ten cakes) in place of the flour, and burn it with all the frankincense as a *memorial* upon the altar of burnt offering. 2. With his brother priests he must eat the remainder within the precincts of the tabernacle. Here the essentials of the sacrifice are the presentation made by the offerer, and the burning of the *memorial* on the altar, followed by the consumption of the remainder by the priests. The moral lesson taught to the Israelite completed that of the burnt offering. As the burnt offering taught self-surrender, so the meat offering taught recognition of God's supremacy and submission to it, the first by the surrender of a living creature substituted for the offerer, the second by the gift of a part of the good things bestowed by God on man for the preservation of life which, being given back to God, serve as a recognition of his supremacy. Spiritually the lesson taught the Jew was that of the necessity of a loyal service to God; and mystically he may have learnt a lesson (1) as to the force of prayer rising up to heaven as the incense which had to be offered with each form of the meat offering; (2) as to the need of purity and incorruption, symbolized by the prohibition of leaven and honey, and the command to use salt. The supplemental character of the meat offering accounts for the order in which it here stands, not arbitrarily interposed between two animal sacrifices, but naturally following on the burnt offering, as an adjunct to it and the complement of its teaching. So close was the union between the two sacrifices, that the burnt offering was never offered without the accompaniment of the meat offering (Numb. xv. 4). It has been also maintained that the meat offering, like the drink offering, was never made independently of the animal sacrifice; but this cannot be proved. On the contrary, the manner in which laws regulating it are here laid down, lead to the inference that it might be offered, when any willed it, by itself. The close connection between the sacrifice of an animal and the offering of cakes of flour, and of wine, is noticeable in heathen sacrifices likewise. The very word, *immolare*, translated "to sacrifice," is derived from the *mola* or salt-cake offered with the animal; and the other word ordinarily used in Latin for "sacrifice," that is, *mactare*, is

derived from the victim being enriched (*magis auctus*) with the libation of wine. Thus we see that the offering of the fruits of the earth was regarded, elsewhere as well as in Judea, as the natural concomitant of an animal sacrifice, and not only that, but as so essential a part of the latter as to have given a name to the whole ceremony, and not only to the whole ceremony, but to the specific act of the slaughter of the victim. The thought of the heathen in offering the fruits of the earth was probably not much different from that of the Israelites. It was his gift to the superhuman power, to which he thus acknowledged that he owed submission. We may further notice that salt was enjoined in the heathen as in the Jewish sacrifices as indispensable. Pliny says that the importance of salt is seen especially in sacrifices, none of which are completed without the salt-cake ('Hist. Nat.' 31, 7) The now obsolete use of the word "meat" in the sense of "food," in contrast to "flesh," creates some confusion of thought. "Fruit offering" would be a better title, were it not that the signification of "fruit" is going through a similar change to that which "meat" has undergone. "Flour offering" might be used, but an alteration in the rendering is not imperative.

Ver. 2.—*He shall take thereout his handful.* This was the task of the priest. The handful that he took and burnt upon the altar has the technical and significative name of the *memorial*. It acted as a *memorial* before God, in the same way as Cornelius's prayers and alms—"Thy prayers and thine alms are come up for a *memorial* before God" (Acts x. 4)—being something which should cause God to think graciously of the offerer. The *frankincense* is not mixed with the flour and the oil and the salt, as a constituent element of the offering, but is placed upon them, and is all of it burnt in "the *memorial*," symbolizing the need of adding prayer to sacrifice, that the latter may be acceptable to God.

Ver. 3.—*The remnant of the meat offering shall be Aaron's and his sons'.* The meat offerings must have gone far to supply the priests with farinaceous food, as, for every handful of flour burnt on the altar, nearly a gallon went to the priests. They had to eat it within the precincts of the tabernacle, as was the case with all meats that were *most holy*, viz. the *minchahs*, the *shew-bread*, and the flesh of the *sin offering* and of the *trespass offering* (ch. x. 12). Other meats assigned to the priests might be eaten in any clean place (ch. x. 14). The priests' own meat offerings were wholly burnt (ch. vi. 23).

Ver. 4—11.—*The second form of meat offering, when the flour and oil were made up*

into four varieties of cakes. The ritual of offering is not different from that of the first form. The frankincense is not mentioned, but doubtless is understood. The rabbinical rule, that meat offerings, when following upon burnt offerings or peace offerings, had no frankincense burnt with them, rests on no solid foundation.

Vers. 11, 12.—*Ye shall burn no leaven nor any honey, in any offering of the Lord made by fire.* Leaven and honey are not forbidden to be offered to the Lord; on the contrary, in the next verse they are commanded to be offered. The prohibition only extends to their being burnt on the altar, owing, no doubt, to the effect of fire upon them in making them swell and froth, thus creating a repulsive appearance which, as we shall see, throughout the Mosaic legislation, represents moral evil. The firstfruits of honey are to be offered (cf. Exod. xxii. 29), and leaven is to be used in the two wave loaves offered at the Feast of Pentecost as firstfruits (ch. xxiii. 17). The words translated *As for the oblation of the firstfruits, ye shall offer them unto the Lord,* should be rendered *As an oblation of firstfruits ye shall offer them* (that is, leaven and honey),

*but they shall not be burnt on the altar.* The mark in A. V. denoting a new paragraph at the beginning of ver. 12, should be removed.

Ver. 13.—*Every oblation of thy meat offering shalt thou season with salt.* Salt is commanded as symbolizing in things spiritual, because preserving in things physical, incorruption (cf. Matt. v. 13; Mark ix. 49; Luke xiv. 34; Col. iv. 6). It is an emblem of an established and enduring covenant, such as God's covenant with his people, which is never to wax old and be destroyed, and it is therefore termed the *salt of the covenant of thy God.* Hence “a covenant of salt” came to mean a covenant that should not be broken (Numb. xviii. 19; 2 Chron. xiii. 5). The use of salt is not confined to the meat offering. *With all thine offerings thou shalt offer salt.* Accordingly we find in Ezek. xliii. 24, “The priest shall cast salt upon them, and they shall offer them up for a burnt offering.”

Vers. 14—16.—The third form of meat offering, parched grains of corn, with oil, salt, and frankincense. The mark of a new paragraph should be transferred from ver. 12 to the beginning of ver. 14.

#### HOMILETICS.

Vers. 1—16.—*The meat offering.* It consisted of a gift to God of the products of the earth most needed for the support of life—flour and oil, to which were added salt and frankincense, and it was generally accompanied by the drink offering of wine. It was offered to God in token of the recognition of his almighty power which gave the corn, the olive, and the vine, and of the submission of the creature to him, the merciful Creator.

I. IT WAS A GIFT OF HOMAGE. As such, it had a meaning well defined and well understood in the East, that meaning being an acknowledgment of the sovereignty of God, and a promise of loyal obedience on the part of the offerer.

II. SCRIPTURAL EXAMPLES OF THE GIFT OF HOMAGE. 1. The sacrifices of Cain and Abel. Whether the sacrifice was of the fruits of the ground or of the flock made no difference. Each was the “minchah,” or “gift,” of the offerer, acknowledging God as his God—one, however, offered loyally, the other hypocritically (Gen. iv. 3, 4). 2. The present sent to Esau by Jacob (Gen. xxxii.; xxxiii.). Jacob had sent a humble message to his brother (Gen. xxxii. 3), but this was not enough, “The messengers returned to Jacob, saying, We came to thy brother Esau, and also he cometh to meet thee, and four hundred men with him” (Gen. xxxii. 6). Then Jacob, terror-stricken, sent his gift of homage (Gen. xxxii. 13), which symbolically acknowledged Esau as his suzerain lord. Esau, by accepting it (Jacob “urged him and he took it”), bound himself to give protection to his brother as to an inferior, and offered to leave some of his soldiers with him for the purpose (Gen. xxxiii. 15). 3. The present carried by Jacob's sons to Joseph when they went down into Egypt (Gen. xliii. 11). 4. The present without which Saul felt that he could not appear before Samuel (1 Sam. ix. 7). 5. The gifts presented to the young Child by the Wise Men of the East (Matt. ii. 11).

III. EXAMPLES OF THE GIFT OF HOMAGE IN THE PRESENT DAY. 1. At an Indian durbar, every one of the dependent princes brings his present, and offers it to the representative of the Empress of India. 2. Presents are always brought by natives of India to British officials set over them, when they have a request to make, and ceremonially accepted by the latter by a touch of the hand. 3. In the Abyssinian war

a present of a thousand oxen and five hundred sheep was sent by King Theodore of Abyssinia to Lord Napier of Magdala, in token of submission at the last moment, and rejected by the English general. Had he accepted it, he would have been bound to give the king protection.

**IV. LESSONS TO US FROM THE MEAT OFFERING.** 1. To give to God of the worldly goods which God has given to us (1) freely, (2) cheerfully, (3) loyally. Our motive must not be self-ostentation, nor the praise of men, nor our own gratification. By our offering to God we must recognize God's claims over us, and openly profess our loving submission to them. This throws a new light on the practice of almsgiving in the weekly offertory of the Church. 2. To give a hearty and loyal service to God in other respects besides almsgiving, such as obedience to his commandments, doing his will on earth.

**V. THE GIFT OF HOMAGE CALLS FORTH A REQUITING GIFT.** Esau gave protection in return for cattle. Joseph gave sacks of corn in return for "a little balm and a little honey, spices and myrrh, nuts and almonds." The representative of the Crown of England gives back to each prince at a durbar a present greater than he has received. So we give to God repentance, and receive back from him forgiveness; we give faith, and receive grace; we give obedience, and receive righteousness; we give thanksgiving, and receive enduring favour; we give, in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the "creatures of bread and wine," and we receive back "the strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the Body and Blood of Christ."

**Ver. 13.—Salt** was to be used with all the sacrifices. Cf. Ezek. xliii. 24; Mark ix. 49.

**I. WHAT IT RECALLED TO THE MIND OF THE OFFERER.** The eating of bread and salt together being the ceremony which finally ratified an agreement or covenant (as it still is in Arabia), salt was associated in the mind of the Israelite with the thought of a firmly established covenant. Each time, therefore, that the priest strewed the salt on the offering there would have been a reminder to all concerned of the peculiar blessing enjoyed by the nation and all members of it, of being in covenant with God, without which they would not have been in a state to offer acceptable sacrifices at all.

**II. WHAT IT SYMBOLIZED.** The effect of salt being to preserve from corruption, its being sprinkled on the sacrifice taught the offerer the necessity of purity and constancy in his devotion of himself to God.

**III. THE SYMBOL TAKEN UP AND APPLIED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.** 1. The Christian's speech is not to be corrupting, but edifying. "Let your speech be always seasoned with salt, that ye may know how ye ought to answer every man" (Col. iv. 6). "Let no corrupt communication proceed out of your mouth, but that which is good for the use of edifying, that it may minister grace unto the hearers" (Eph. iv. 29). 2. Christian men are to be salted with fire, as the sacrifices are salted with salt (Mark ix. 49), and the life of the collective body of Christians, the Church, is to be, in its effects upon the world, as salt. "Ye are the salt of the earth" (Matt. v. 13). "Have salt in yourselves" (Mark ix. 50). Men influenced by the Spirit of Christ, having been themselves salted with fire, have now become the salt which saves the world from perishing in its own corruption.

**IV. THE SALT MAY LOSE ITS SAVOUR** (Matt. v. 13; Mark ix. 50; Luke xiv. 34). This is the case when "doctrine" being no longer characterized by "uncorruption, gravity, sincerity" (Titus ii. 7), religion becomes changed into superstition, thenceforward debasing instead of elevating mankind; or when it stirs men to acts of fanaticism, or rebellion, or cruelty; or when the spiritual life becomes so dead within it that it abets instead of counteracting the wickedness of the world.

**V. SALT SYMBOLIZES PERMANENCY AS WELL AS PURITY.** Our love for Christ must be, St. Paul teaches us (Eph. vi. 24), a love "in sincerity," or rather, as the word should be translated, "in incorruption," that is, an abiding love, without human caprice or changeableness; and our obedience to God must be constant, without breaks in its even course, and lasting to the end of life. "Because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold. But he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved" (Matt. xxiv. 12, 13). "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life" (Rev. ii. 10).

## HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

*Consecrated life-work, as brought out in the meat offering.* Ch. ii. 1—11; cf. John iv. 34; Acts x. 4; Phil. iv. 18; John vi. 27. The idea prominently presented in the burnt offering is, we have seen, *personal consecration*, on the ground of *expiation* and *acceptance* through a substitute. In the meat offering, to which we now address ourselves, we find the further and supplementary idea of *consecrated life-work*. For the fine flour presented was the product of labour, the actual outcome of the consecrated person, and consequently a beautiful representative of that whole life-work which results from a person consciously consecrated. Moreover, as in the case of the burnt offering there was a daily celebration, so in the case of this meat offering there was a perpetual dedication in the *shew-bread*. What we have in this chapter, therefore, is a voluntary dedication on the part of an individual, corresponding to the perpetual dedication on the part of the people. The covenant people are to realize the idea of consecration in their whole life-work. Lange has noticed that here it is the soul (*נפש*) which is said to present the meat offering, something more spiritual, as an act, than the presentation of the burnt offering by the man (*חניכת*). We assume, then, that the leading thought of this meat offering is *consecrated life-work*, such as was brought out in all its perfection when our Lord declared, "My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish his work" (John iv. 34).

**I. WORK DONE FOR GOD SHOULD BE THE BEST OF ITS KIND.** The meat offering, whether prepared in a sumptuous oven ( *תנור*) such as would be found with the wealthy, or baked in a pan ( *שְׂלֵד*) such as middle-class people would employ, or seethed in a common dish ( *שְׂלֵד*) the utensil of the poor,—was always to be of fine flour ( *שְׂלֵד*), that is, flour separated from the bran. It matters not what our station in life may be, we may still present to God a *thorough* piece of work. "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might" (Eccles. ix. 10) is an exhortation applicable to all. The microscopic thoroughness of God's work in nature, which leads him to clothe even the grass, which is to-morrow to be cast into the oven, with more glory than Solomon (Matt. vi. 28—30), is surely fitted to stimulate every consecrated person to the most painstaking work.

And here we are led of necessity to the life-work of Jesus Christ, as embodying this idea perfectly. How thoroughly he did everything! His life was an exquisite piece of moral mosaic. Every detail may be subjected to the most microscopic criticism, only to reveal its marvellous and matchless beauty.

**II. WORK DONE FOR GOD SHOULD BE PERMEATED BY HIS SPIRIT AND GRACE.** The fine flour, be it ever so pure, would not be accepted dry; it required *oil* to make it *bakeable*. Oil has been from time immemorial the symbol of Divine *unction*, in other words, of the Holy Spirit's gracious operation. Hence we infer that work done for God must be done in co-operation with the Spirit. It is when we realize that we are fellow-workers with God, that he is our Partner, that he is working in us and by us, and when, in consequence, we become spiritually minded, walking in the Spirit, living in the Spirit,—it is then that our work becomes a spiritual thing.

And here, again, would we direct attention to the life-work of Christ, as spiritually perfect. The gift of the Spirit at his baptism, the descending dove, an organic whole (Luke iii. 22), signalizes the complete spirituality of Jesus. He was "filled with the Spirit," it was "in the power of the Spirit" he did all his work. Herein he is our perfect Example.

**III. WORK CAN ONLY BE DONE FOR GOD IN A PRAYERFUL SPIRIT.** This follows naturally from what has been already stated, but it requires to be emphasized in view of the *frankincense* which had in every case to accompany the meat offering. This is admittedly the symbol of devotion (cf. Kalisch, *in loco*). A life-work, to be consecrated, must be steeped in prayer; its Godward object must be kept constantly in view, and stated and ejaculatory prayer must envelop it like a cloud of incense.

It is, again, worth while to notice how the perfect life-work of Christ was pervaded by prayer. If any one since the world began had a right to excuse himself from the formality of prayer in consequence of his internal state of illumination, it was Jesus

Christ. And yet we may safely say that his was the most prayerful life ever spent on earth. As Dr. Guthrie once said, "The sun as it sank in the western sea often left him, and as it rose behind the hills of Moab returned to find him, on his knees." We need not wonder why he spent whole nights in supplication, for he was bringing every detail of his work into Divine review in the exercise of prayer. There is consequently a most significant appeal issuing out of his holy life, to work prayerfully at all times if we would work for God.

**IV. WORK FOR GOD MUST BE DIVORCED FROM MALICE AND FROM PASSION, AND DONE IN CALM PURITY AND STRENGTH.** Much of the world's work has malice and passion for its sources. These motives seem to be symbolized by the *leaven* and *honey*, which were forbidden as elements in the meat offering. Care should be taken in work for God that we do not impart into it worldly and selfish motives. Such are sure to vitiate the whole effort. The Lord with whom we have to do looks upon the heart, and weighs the motives along with the work.

What a commentary, again, was the perfect life of Jesus upon this! Malice and passion never mixed with his pure motives. He sought not his own will, nor did he speak his own words, but calmly kept the Father's will and glory before him, all through.

**V. WORK FOR GOD SHOULD BE COMMITTED TO HIS PRESERVING CARE.** For it is to be feared we often forget to season our sacrifices with *salt*. We work for God in a consecrated spirit, but we do not universally commit our work to his preserving grace, and expect its permanency and purity. Work for God *should* endure. It is our own fault if it do not.

Our blessed Lord committed his work to the preserving care of the Father. He was, if we may judge from Isa. xlix. 4, as well as from the Gospel, sometimes discouraged, yet when constrained to say, "I have laboured in vain, I have spent my strength for nought, and in vain," he could add, "Yet surely my judgment is with the Lord, and my work with my God."

**VI. WORK DONE FOR GOD IS SURE TO BENEFIT OUR FELLOW-MEN.** The meat offering was only partially burnt on the altar—a handful, containing, however, all the frankincense, was placed in the sacred fire, and thus accepted; the rest became the property of the priest. How beautifully this indicated the truth that when one tries to please God, his fellow-men, and especially those of the household of faith, are sure to participate in the blessing! The monastic idea was an imperfect one, suggesting the possibility of devotion to God and indifference to man coexisting in the same breast. We deceive ourselves so long as we suppose so.

Our Master went about doing good; he was useful as well as holy; and so shall all his followers find themselves, if their consecrated life-work is moulded according to the pattern he has shown us. Faithfulness in the first table of the Law secures faithfulness in the second.—R. M. E.

*About honouring God with our firstfruits.* Ch. ii. 12—16; cf. Prov. iii. 9; 1 Cor. xv. 23; Jas. i. 18. This arrangement about the firstfruits, though appended to the meat offering, demands a special notice. The meat offering, we have seen, affirms the general principle that our life-work should be dedicated to God. But here in the firstfruits we have a special portion which is to be regarded as too sacred for any but Divine use. This leads us directly to affirm—

**I. WHILE GOD HAS A RIGHT TO ALL, HE CLAIMS A SPECIAL RIGHT TO THE FIRSTFRUITS OF ALL OUR INCREASE.** The danger is in losing sight of the special claim in asserting the general principle. For instance, we must not deny God a special claim upon the first day of the week, because we acquiesce in the general principle that he has a right to all our time. Again, we must not withhold our tithes, a certain proportion of our substance, through an easy-going statement that he has a right to all our substance. We must condescend to particulars.

**II. THE DEDICATION OF THE FIRSTFRUITS EXTENDED TO ANIMALS AS WELL AS TO THE VEGETABLE KINGDOM.** The dedication of the firstborn of man and beast is manifestly part and parcel of the same principle (Exod. xiii. 1—16). This leads up to God's right to the Firstborn of the human race, to him of whom the Father said, "I will make him

my firstborn, higher than the kings of the earth" (Ps. lxxxix. 27). Jesus is the Firstborn of humanity, the flower and firstfruits of the race. Hence we find the expression used regarding the risen Saviour, "But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the firstfruits of them that slept" (1 Cor. xv. 23). He is also called "the firstborn from the dead" (Col. i. 18). Of him, therefore, pre-eminently was the dedication of the firstfruits typical.

If God has a right to the firstfruits of the life-work of the human race, he receives them in the perfectly holy life of Jesus Christ. So that, as we found the meat offering pointing to this, so do we find this arrangement about the firstfruits.

**III. GOD HAS ALSO A RIGHT TO SERVICE, EVEN THOUGH IT MAY NOT BE PERFECT.** This seems to be the principle underlying the "oblation of the firstfruits." This, as we learn from ch. xxiii. 15—21, was presented at Pentecost, and consisted of two tenth-deals of flour baked with leaven. Such an arrangement points to the possibility of imperfection in serving God, which was met by the *sin offering* accompanying it. If, then, the firstfruits at the Passover, presented with oil and frankincense, typified Christ the Firstfruits in all his perfection; the oblation at Pentecost typified believers, Gentiles and Jews, who are trying, though imperfectly, to realize a consecrated life-work. God does not reject the labours of his people, even though they are very far from perfect. He has provided a *sin offering* to meet the imperfections of the case and render all acceptable to him.<sup>1</sup>

**IV. THE DEDICATION OF THE FIRSTFRUITS WAS THE EXPRESSION NOT ONLY OF THANKSGIVING BUT ALSO OF FAITH.** God's rights first, even before man's need has been met. It was seeking God's kingdom first, in the assurance that all the needful things shall be added (Matt. vi. 33). It is most important that we should always act in this trustful spirit. This faith is, in fact, a kind of firstfruits of the spiritual life which the Lord expects, and in rendering it to him we experience wondrous comfort and blessing.—R. M. E.

**Vers. 1—3.—Mediate and immediate presentation.** The abrogation by Christianity of the rites and ceremonies of Judaism does not prevent the necessity nor dispel the advantages of becoming acquainted with the laws by which the ancient sacrifices were regulated. The mind of God may be ascertained in the precepts delivered in olden days, and underlying principles recognized that hold good in every age. The very fact that truth has thus to be searched for, and by patient induction applied to present conditions, should prove an incitement rather than hindrance to investigation. Freeing the kernel from its husk, grasping the essence and neglecting the accidents, preferring the matter to the form, we shall behold in the Law prophecies of the gospel, and admit the likeness that proclaims both to have proceeded from the same God.

**I. A DISTINCTION IS MADE BETWEEN OFFERINGS ACCEPTED BY GOD DIRECTLY, AND THOSE PRESENTED TO HIM INDIRECTLY FOR THE USE OF HIS APPOINTED SERVANTS.** The flour being brought to the priests, a handful was taken, and with frankincense was burnt upon the altar, rising to heaven in the form of smoke and perfume. The remainder of the flour was for the consumption of the priests. This distinction is applicable to many Christian offerings. The money given for the erection or support of a place of prayer, the surrender of time and thought for public worship, or for evangelistic work, the acknowledgment of Jesus Christ by baptism and by partaking of the Lord's Supper, the devotion of our strength and influence to God's service,—these may be considered as gifts presented straight to God himself. They are laid upon the altar, enwrapped in the fire of holy love, perfumed with prayer, and are consumed with the zeal of God's house. But there are other oblations which must be regarded in the light of mediate presentations to God, such as, supporting the ministry at home and missionaries abroad, ministering to the need of the aged and feeble, and giving the cup of water to the disciples of Christ. This distinction is not meant to glorify the one class in comparison with the other, but to clarify our views, and to lead to the inquiry whether we are doing all we can in both directions. There is an idea in many minds that if the works of benevolence and charity be performed, the other duties of gathering together in the solemn assembly and of avowal of attach-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Lowe's 'Annual Feasts of the Jews,' pp. 22—45.

ment to Christ are of little importance. The burning of a portion of the offering upon the altar rebukes such a conception. And similarly we learn that the punctual attendance upon the means of grace, and the regular offering of praise and prayer, must not exclude the exercise of hospitality and sympathy.

II. Looking at these two classes separately, we remark, respecting the bestowment of the "remnant" upon the priests, that OFFERINGS TO GOD MUST BE PRESENTED IN THEIR ENTIRETY. All the flour brought was considered "most holy," and could not be employed thereafter except for the benefit of "sacred" persons. A man was at liberty to offer or withhold, but once having vowed, he could not withdraw even a portion of his present. God will not be satisfied with a share of a man's heart. If it be given at all, it must be the whole heart. And once having engaged ourselves to be his, there can be no revocation of faculty, affection or time. To look back after taking hold of the plough is to mar religious dedication. The mistake of Ananias was in pretending to give the full price, and attempting to conceal a portion of it. Oh that we could make religion permeate our lives, hallowing even our secular employments by doing all to the glory of God!

III. With respect to the portion burnt for a "memorial," observe that AN OFFERING HAS A DOUBLE INTENT; IT EVINCES A GRATEFUL REMEMBRANCE BY THE WORSHIPPER OF GOD'S BOUNTY AND REQUIREMENTS, AND IT ENSURES A GRACIOUS REMEMBRANCE OF THE WORSHIPPER ON THE PART OF GOD. The special significance of the "minchah" lay in its expression of thankfulness, and of desire by that expression to secure the favour of the God by whom our needs are supplied. To appreciate past kindness is to show a fitness to receive additional mercies in the future. To remember God is to be remembered in turn by God. At the Communion we take the bread and wine as Christ's memorial, and he, the Master of the feast, approves the spirit and the act, and thinks upon us for good. Self-interest recommends us to honour the Lord. To save a handful of meal would be to lose a coming harvest, and to save ourselves temporally is to lose eternally.

IV. ALL OFFERINGS MADE IN THE APPOINTED WAY ARE WELL PLEASING UNTO GOD. The meal oblation differed from the sacrifice of a lamb or bullock, perhaps was not so expensive, and all of it was not consumed by fire; yet it was also declared to be "of a sweet savour unto the Lord." We should not trouble ourselves because our kind of service is distinct from that which our fellows render, or is treated by the world as less important. The mites of the widow lie side by side in the treasury with the shekels of the wealthy, and will receive quite as much notice from the Lord of the sanctuary. If a niche in the temple of heroes is denied to us, or if the eloquence that sways the wills of men belongs not to our tongue, yet may we with kindly words and manly actions and loving tones do our little part in Christianizing the world, and our efforts will win the commendation of him who "seeth not as man seeth." And further, let us not be sad because at different periods we do not find ourselves able to render the same service. In the winter we may sacrifice from our herds and flocks, but must wait till the summer for the firstfruits of the field. Youth, manhood, and age have their appropriate labours. Leisure and business, health and sickness, prosperity and adversity, may present to the Lord equally acceptable offerings.—S. R. A.

Ver. 13.—*The salt of the covenant.* It has been thought by some unworthy of the notion of an Infinite Being to consider him as concerned about such petty details as those here laid down for observance. But since the Deity had to deal with uninstructed creatures, with men whose ideas of his greatness and holiness were obscure and imperfect, it was surely wise to act according to the analogy furnished by the customs of earthly monarchs, whose courts require attention to be paid to numberless points of behaviour. Only thus could the august nature of Jehovah, the majesty of his attributes, and the solemnity of religious worship be duly impressed upon the minds of the Israelites. Every rite had a meaning, and to add salt to every offering was a command we shall find it interesting to study.

I. OBEDIENCE TO THIS COMMAND CONSTITUTES EVERY OFFERING A PART OF THE COVENANT BETWEEN GOD AND HIS PEOPLE. It was by virtue of a special covenant that the nation had been selected as the vehicle of Divine revelation and the repository of Divine favours. The relation of superiority in which God stands to man,

places in a strong light his condescension in making an agreement by which he binds himself as well as the people. Every covenant implies mutual obligations. God promised to guide and bless the Israelites if they, in their turn, kept his commandments and held him in proper esteem. To put salt, therefore, in compliance with his behest, was to acknowledge that the covenant remained in force, and the act became a present instance of the existence of the covenant. It was as much as to say, "I present this gift because of the covenanted relationship in which I stand to Jehovah." The covenant of the gospel is ratified in Christ for all his faithful seed, who are made partakers of the blessing promised to Abraham (Gal. iii. 16). Hence whatever we do is in the name of Christ, recognizing our sonship, heirship, and co-heirship. The covenant influences, embraces all thoughts and deeds.

II. SALT, AS THE EMBLEM OF HOSPITALITY, SHOWS THAT SERVICE TO GOD IS A FEAST OF FRIENDSHIP. The offering of flour on which oil was poured was itself indicative of a friendly meal, and this view was strengthened by adding salt to the sacrifice. So surprising is the intimacy to which the Most High admits his people, that they may be said to feed daily at his table; all the fruits of the earth are the product of his bounty, which honours men as his guests. We do but render to God what he first bestowed, and in thus approaching we enjoy his presence and favour. It is permitted us to make ready for the Passover, whereat the Lord shall sit down with his disciples.

III. SALT, AS A PRESERVATIVE, REMINDS US OF THE PURITY WHICH SHOULD CHARACTERIZE OUR LIVES. Nothing that partakes of corruption is fit to be brought unto the ever-living God. "Let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit." "Flesh and blood" tend to impurity and death, and "cannot inherit the kingdom of God." Our speech must be with grace, seasoned with salt, lest anything destructive of peace or edification should issue from our lips. Apart from the life that is instilled through faith in Christ, man is dead, and decay is loathsome. Without faith our walk and conversation cannot please God, nor are we "the salt of the earth." Christians are salted with the purifying fire of trial (Mark ix. 49).

IV. SALT TEACHES US THE PERPETUITY OF OUR FRIENDSHIP WITH GOD. A covenant of salt is for ever. (See Numb. xviii. 19 and 2 Chron. xiii. 5.) It lasts as long as the conditions are observed by us, for God will never change, nor desire on his part to revoke his blessing. Let us rejoice in the truth that he abideth faithful, and in the thought of the indissoluble alliance thereby created. He does not wish to treat us as playthings, invented to amuse him temporarily, and then to be tossed aside. We are put in possession by the great Healer and Life-restorer of imperishable principles, seeds of righteousness, that avert corruption and defy decay. Our devotion is not a hireling service that may soon terminate, but a consecration for the everlasting ages.—S. R. A.

Vers. 7—13.—*The offering of daily life.* It is interesting to perceive how the instructions here recorded made it possible for all classes of the people to bring sacrifices to Jehovah. None could complain of want of sufficient means or of the necessary cooking utensils. All such objections are forestalled by these inclusive arrangements. Whether consisting of "cakes" or "wafers," whether baked on a flat iron plate or boiled in a pot, the offering was lawful and acceptable. How, then, can we imagine that Christian work and gifts are so restricted in their nature as to be procurable only by a few?

I. THE MATERIAL OF WHICH THIS OFFERING WAS COMPOSED. "His offering shall be of fine flour." The sacrifice God desires is of what man deems most precious, viz. life. As the animal was killed, giving up its life to God, so now there is presented in this oblation: 1. Something that belongs to *daily life*. 2. Contributing to its *support*; 3. and *enjoyment*. By bestowing of our substance upon God, all our property is sanctified. To set apart specifically a portion of time in which to worship God, hallows the remainder of the week. See in Jesus the true Meal Oblation, the Bread of Life. We ask the Father to accept his offering on our behalf, and we also live on him as our spiritual food. 4. The sample presented must be of *the best of its kind*. God will not be slighted with scanty adoration and inferior exercise of our powers. Only wheaten flour is permitted.

II. ACCOMPANIMENTS OF THE OFFERING. Allusions to the Jewish sacrifices are frequent in the New Testament, and we cannot be wrong in guiding ourselves by such

an interpretation of these figurative regulations. 1. Oil must be added. It was the element of consecration, and reminds us of the needful anointing of the Spirit to qualify us for our duties. "Ye have an unction from the Holy One." As used, like butter, to impart a relish to food, it became a symbol of gladness. So the Christian motto is, "Rejoice in the Lord alway." 2. Frankincense is required that a pleasant odour may ascend to the skies. So may our service be redolent to earth and heaven of a fragrant savour. In Rev. viii. 3, incense is offered with the prayers of the saints, and speaks to us of the intercession of Christ, by which our pleadings are made effectual. Let prayer be the constant attitude of our souls, and let us connect the Saviour with all we do and say. 3. It must be seasoned with salt, a remembrance and an emblem of God's covenant, by which his people are admitted to intimacy and friendship with him. The status of the believer is an indissoluble alliance with the Almighty on the ground of promise and oath. This is his privilege and motive power. Every sacrifice must be salted with the salt of holy obedience, producing peace and purity, and preserving it from corruption.

III. THINGS PROHIBITED. 1. Leaven, the emblem of wickedness, of hypocrisy, of fermenting putridity. 2. Honey, which, though sweet and increasing the delight with which food is partaken of, quickly turns to bitterness and corruption. It is regarded as typical of fleshly lusts which war against the soul, that love of the world which mars Christian character. The warning conveyed by these prohibitions is worthy of being sharply outlined in modern days, when the tendency waxes stronger to obliterate the dividing line between the Church and the world, and attempts are made to purify the impure, or to whiten the outside of supulchres, and to seduce Christians into the belief that all the pursuits and pleasures of life may be harmlessly indulged in, and even sanctified to the glory of God. The first intention may be good, but the ultimate issue is unbounded licence. Christ and Belial, light and darkness, can have no lasting concord. We may, however, take the leaven and honey as indicating the truth that some things lawful in themselves and at certain seasons, are at other times displeasing to God. The mirth and music and demeanour that are innocent as such, may not befit us in the solemnity of special circumstances, for example, the worship of the sanctuary. "To everything there is a season."

CONCLUSION. The perfect realization of every offering is seen in the Lord our Saviour. What a matchless life was his! No stain of malice or lust; grace, beauty, purity, all exemplified in fullest degree; on him the Spirit ever rested; his words and works a continual sacrifice to his Father, evoking the exclamation, "This is my beloved Son: hear him." As the heavenly Manna, he satisfies the wants of his kingdom of priests, and his Body was consumed in the flames of Calvary as our memento before God.—S. R. A.

Vers. 1, 2.—*The minchah, a type of Christ.* Because the minchah was an offering without blood, and therefore was not intended as a sacrifice for sin (Heb. ix. 22), some have supposed that it was in use before the Fall. This opinion, however, has but little to sustain it. We certainly read of the minchah as having been offered by Cain (Gen. iv. 3); but then Abel, at the same time, offered the holocaust, or sin offering, which no one dreams of having formed any part of the original worship in Eden. Cain's fault was not in having offered the minchah, but in not associating with it some sin sacrifice. It is questionable whether the minchah, under the Law, was ever offered without such an accompaniment. Yet we may view the minchah as a type of Christ. For—

I. ALL THE HOLY BREAD TYPIFIED CHRIST. 1. *The manna was of this class.* (1) It is called "bread from heaven" (see Neh. ix. 15). (2) Compare John vi. 31—35, 41, 48—51. 2. *The shew-bread also was of this class.* (1) It was the bread of heaven, for it rested in the sanctuary, which was one of the typical "heavenly places." (2) It rested under the splendours of the Shechinah, and therefore took its name, "Bread of Faces," viz. of God. The Bread of the Sacred Presence. 3. *So was this bread of the minchah.* (1) This, indeed, was offered in the outer court; for there the altar stood. But so was Christ offered "outside the gate" of Jerusalem, and outside the courts of heaven. (2) But it was, like the shew-bread, destined to be eaten in the sanctuary. So is Christ eaten by his spiritual priesthood in his kingdom of heaven upon earth.

So is he destined to nourish the joys of the glorified in the heaven of heavens (Luke xxii. 30). (3) This was a *Eucharistic* offering, and equivalent to the bread of the Christian Eucharist (Matt. xxvi. 26; 1 Cor. x. 16).

II. THIS BREAD HAD THE QUALITY OF EXCELLENCE. 1. *As bread it was the staple of food.* (1) We can dispense with luxuries, but bread is necessary. It is "the staff of life." So is Christ. (2) Bread is, by a figure of speech, put for everything needful for the body (Matt. vi. 12). Christ is, by no figure of speech, everything needful to the soul. 2. *This bread was of "fine flour."* (1) It may have been of barley as well as of wheat (see Numb. v. 15). Every variety of spiritual nourishment may be found in Christ. (2) But the flour must be "fine." The nourishment we find in Christ is of the finest order. Christ is God's best Gift to us. So is Christ our best Gift to God. All secondary gifts are valuable as they are offered in his Name (2 Cor. ix. 15).

III. IT HAD NOTICEABLE ADJUNCTS. 1. *Oil was poured upon it.* (1) The oil was from the olive, a tree full of fatness (Judg. ix. 9). It is a symbol of the Holy Spirit's grace (Matt. xxv. 4). (2) The fine flour was anointed with it. Messiah is so named because anointed with the Holy Ghost without measure. The Greek synonym of the Hebrew Messiah is *Christ* (Isa. lxi. 1; Acts iv. 27; x. 38; Heb. i. 9). (3) We are called *Christians* because anointed by the Spirit of Christ (see 2 Cor. i. 21; 1 John ii. 20, 27). 2. *It was offered with frankincense.* (1) This was a favourite spice, which appears not to have been yielded by one tree alone, but probably was compounded from several. We read of "spikenard and saffron; calamus and cinnamon, with all trees of frankincense" (Cant. iv. 14). (2) It is associated with the Bridegroom in the Song of Songs, to express the perfections of his holy character, by which he is infinitely attractive to his Spouse, the Church. He is there described as coming up out of the wilderness "like pillars of smoke," probably alluding to the Shechinah, and "perfumed with myrrh and frankincense, with all the powders of the merchant" (Cant. iii. 6). (3) In these perfections he is no less grateful to God when offered up to him (Matt. iii. 17; xvii. 5; 2 Pet. i. 17). As we become Christ-like, we are also well pleasing in his sight. The faithful minister of the Word is "unto God a sweet savour of Christ" (2 Cor. ii. 15).—

J. A. M.

Vera. 1—10.—*The feast upon the minchah.* In our remarks upon the two first of these verses, we viewed the minchah, or meat offering, as a type of Christ. Upon this point additional light may be incidentally thrown as we now proceed to consider the feast upon the minchah. For this we hold to be designed to represent our fellowship with God in Christ.

I. FEASTS HAVE EVER BEEN REGARDED AS TOKENS OF FRIENDSHIP. 1. *Secular history abounds in examples.* (1) These date back to very ancient times. The ancient Egyptians, Thracians, and Libyans made contracts of friendship by presenting a cup of wine to each other. Covenants were made by the ancient Persians and Germans at feasts. The Pythagoreans had a symbol, "Break no bread," which Erasmus interprets to mean "Break no friendship." (2) Similar usages still obtain. It would be considered amongst us a most incongruous thing for persons at enmity deliberately to sit down at the same table. So according to our laws, if a person drinks to another against whom he has an accusation of slander, he loses his suit, because this supposes that they are reconciled. 2. *Sacred history also furnishes examples.* (1) Isaac and Abimelech made a covenant with a feast (Gen. xxvi. 30, 31); so did Jacob and Laban (Gen. xxxi. 54); so did David and Abner (2 Sam. iii. 20). (2) The verb (*רְאֵת*, *berah*) to eat, in the Hebrew, if not the root of the word (*רְאֵת*, *berith*), covenant, is at least a kindred word. (3) Hence in apostolic times, Christians were forbidden to eat with wicked persons (1 Cor. v. 11; see also Gal. ii. 12). It must never be forgotten that the "friendship of the world is enmity against God."

II. THE FEAST OF THE MEAT OFFERING WAS A SYMBOL OF FELLOWSHIP WITH GOD. 1. *The "memorial" of the minchah was God's meat.* (1) The offerer separated a portion of the mass, which was called the memorial, or representation of the whole. Thus he took from the bulk of the fine flour a handful. To this he added a suitable proportion of oil. The whole of the frankincense was devoted. (2) The priest then burnt the complete memorial upon the altar of burnt offerings. (3) God signified his acceptance of it by consuming it in fire, which was not of human kindling, but had issued from

LEVITICUS.

D

his Shechinah. The portion thus consumed was regarded as "God's food," or "meat," of the offering which he was pleased to accept. This was one part of the feast. 2. *The remnant was then eaten by the priests.* (1) The priests here are not to be viewed as types of Christ. The high priest alone seems to have represented him (Heb. iii. 1; viii. 11). (2) The common priests were representatives rather of the holy people. Hence the whole nation of Israel were regarded as a "kingdom of priests" (Exod. xix. 6). The people, therefore, and in particular the offerer, representatively, feasted with God. (3) Under the gospel even this official representation is changed. The people of God are now an holy priesthood, not by representation, but in right of their spiritual birth (1 Pet. ii. 9). They draw nigh unto God (Heb. x. 19-22). They feast with him at his table and in his very Presence. (4) All this, amongst many other blessed things, is set forth in the Christian Eucharist, or Supper of the Lord.

III. CHRIST IS THE MEDIUM OF THIS FELLOWSHIP. 1. *Obviously so since the minchah was a type of Christ.* (1) This has been sufficiently shown (see Homily on vers. 1, 2). (2) We may add that the argument is sustained by the use of the term "memorial." When the firstling of the cattle was taken instead of the rest, it is called making a memorial to God (Exod. xxxiv. 19; see Hebrew text). This represented the taking of the Great Firstborn instead of all men, and the firstling of the cattle was only a *memorial*, not the real sacrifice. (3) It is a great truth that Christ is our one way of access to God (John xiv. 6). "He is our peace;" and it is through the frankincense of his presence that our offering becomes a "sweet savour"—a savour of rest, "unto the Lord" (vers. 2, 9). 2. *Christ is delectable food to faith.* (1) Sometimes in the minchah the flour was unbaked (ver. 2). In this case the oil accompanying it was unmixed. The portion reserved for the priests might, therefore, be mingled by them in any way they pleased to render it most palatable. (2) In other cases the bread was prepared to their hands. Sometimes baked in the oven in cakes, mingled with oil, or in unleavened wafers, with oil poured upon them (ver. 4). Sometimes in a pan or flat plate, mingled with oil or oil poured over it (vers. 5, 6). Sometimes in the frying-pan or gridiron, with oil (ver. 7). (3) The bread of life is essentially good and nourishing. It is at the same time capable of being served up in such variety as to suit every taste that is not vicious. It is the privilege of the scribe instructed in the kingdom to bring out "things new and old," to set old things in new lights, and to show that there is "nothing new under the sun;" for all things are as old as the councils of eternity.—J. A. M.

Vers. 11-13.—*Notable things.* After describing the minchah under sundry forms, and before proceeding to the meat offering of the firstfruits, certain notable things are mentioned which the minchah has in common with sacrifices in general. These now claim attention, viz.—

I. THE PROHIBITION OF LEAVEN (ver. 11). The reasons of this appear to be: 1. *Because of its fermenting properties.* (1) These, which, under the action of heat, throw the lump into commotion, represent the evil passions of the heart (see 1 Cor. v. 6-8). But since the meat offering is taken as a type of Christ, it was most fitting that everything suggestive of these should be excluded. In him was no ferment of anger or discontent when he was subjected to the fiercest fires of the wrath of God (Isa. liii. 7). What an example has he left to us! (2) By its fermenting properties, leaven tended to reduce substances to corruption. But since our "Bread of Life," our "Firstfruit" of the resurrection, could not "see corruption," because he was the "Holy One," it was most proper that leaven should be absent from his type (Pa. xvi. 10; Acts ii. 31). 2. *That the Hebrews might be reminded of their deliverance from Egypt.* (1) For they were, at the time of the Exodus, so hurried that they had to take their dough as it was without being leavened (Exod. xii. 39). It was most salutary to keep alive the remembrance of such mercies as they then experienced, and of the stupendous works with which they were associated. (2) But since those things were all typical of gospel blessings, so must it be most edifying to us to remember the spiritual bondage and darkness from which we have been emancipated by the hand of that great Prophet "like unto Moses," to whom it is our duty to hearken in preference to him.

II. THE PROHIBITION OF HONEY (ver. 11). The reasons of this appear to be: 1. *Because honey was a symbol of carnal pleasures.* (1) It was in this light viewed by Philo

and by Jerome: and certainly the similitude is apt. Though luscious to the palate, it is bitter to the stomach. So evermore is sensual gratification (see Prov. xxv. 16, 27). (2) The exclusion of honey from the sacrifices and offerings of the altar will, therefore, convey important morals, viz. (a) considering these as types of Christ, (b) considering them also as types of such spiritual sacrifices as we can present acceptably to God through Christ. Another reason may be: 2. *Because honey was offered with the abominations of the heathen.* (1) Honey was offered to Bacchus and to the *di' superi*, the *di' inferi*, and departed heroes. Hence Orpheus, in beginning his hymns, calls the infernal gods *μελιχοι θεοι*, and the souls of the dead, *μελισσαι*. The origin of which custom is thus explained by Porphyry, "They made honey a symbol of death; and therefore poured out a libation of honey to the terrestrial gods" (see Brown's 'Antiquities,' vol. i. p. 331). (2) The Hebrews were instructed scrupulously to avoid the customs of the pagans (see Deut. xii. 29—31). Let Protestants studiously avoid the abominations of the Romish Antichrist (Rev. xviii. 4). (3) Leaven and honey might be offered with the oblation of the firstfruits; but they must not come upon God's altar. This is the teaching of ver. 12. The loaves of the firstfruits, which were perquisites of the priests, were even ordered to be baked with leaven (ch. xxiii. 17). So in like manner honey was to be offered to them (2 Chron. xxxi. 5). There are things which may be lawfully offered to man that may not be offered to God. As leaven and honey mingled with the bread, even of the priests, so human conversation, at its best, is but imperfect.

III. THE REQUISITION OF SALT (ver. 13). The reason of this appears in the many excellent things of which salt was the symbol. 1. *It was a symbol of purity.* (1) Hence it is described as "the salt of the covenant of God." The Hebrew term for covenant (*בְּרִית*, *berith*) literally signifies *purification*; and the covenant of God is the gospel which is instituted of God for our purification from sin. (2) Perhaps it was religiously, viz. in relation to the covenant, rather than for hygienic purposes, that infants were rubbed with salt (see Ezek. xvi. 4). 2. *It was a symbol of friendship.* (1) The effect of a covenant to the faithful is friendship. So, in token of friendship, the ancient Greeks ate bread and salt together. And the Russian emperors had a custom, derived to them from antiquity, of sending bread and salt from their tables to persons they intended to honour. (2) The delights of friendship are also set forth in this symbol. The following is rendered by Dr. A. Clarke from Pliny:—"So essentially necessary is salt that without it human life cannot be preserved: and even the pleasures and endowments of the mind are expressed by it; the delights of life, repose, and the highest mental serenity are expressed by no other term than *sales* among the Latins. It has also been applied to designate the honourable rewards given to soldiers, which are called *salarii* or *salaries*. But its importance may be further understood by its use in sacred things, as no sacrifice was offered to the gods without the *salt-cake*." (3) But that "conversation" of Christians is best "seasoned" that has the "salt of the covenant" (see Job vi. 6; Col. iv. 5, 6). 3. *It was a symbol of perpetuity.* (1) This is suggested by its preserving properties. It is used to preserve meat and other things from decomposing. It is in this the very opposite of leaven; so, the reason which includes the one excludes the other. (2) Hence by the symbol of salt the perpetuity of God's covenant is expressed. Thus, "It is a covenant of salt for ever before the Lord" (Numb. xviii. 19; see also 2 Chron. xiii. 5). (3) Christians, who are the people of the covenant, are the preservers of the earth (see Matt. v. 13). Take the Christians out of the world, and it will rot. 4. *The qualities of salt should distinguish all sacrifices.* (1) They do distinguish the Great Sacrifice of Calvary. (2) All Christian offerings should resemble that. In allusion to the salting of sacrifices preparatory to their being offered up in the flames of the altar, our Lord says, "Every one shall be salted with fire," or rather, "salted for the fire," viz. of the altar, "and," or rather, "as every sacrifice is salted with salt" (Mark ix. 49, 50). "We may reasonably infer, that as salt has two qualities—the one to season meat, the other to preserve it from corruption; so it fitly denotes that integrity and incorruptness which season every sacrifice, and render men's persons and services grateful to God" (Old Bible).—J. A. M.

Vers. 14—16.—*The minchah of the firstfruits.* Having viewed the minchah as a type of Christ, and having considered the feast upon it as expressing fellowship with God in

him, we proceed to consider the offering of the firstfruits, which is still the minchah under yet another form. The text brings before us—

I. THINGS PECULIAR TO THE OFFERING OF THE FIRSTFRUITS. These are: 1. *The matter of the offering.* (1) It is specified as "green ears of corn." Still, observe, it is of the nature of bread, and so still typified Christ, the Bread of Life. (2) But in this case the life is in the grain. In this view Christ compares himself to a corn of wheat (John xii. 24). In this passage there is also a reference to Ps. lxxii. 16, which is construed by learned Jews thus: "He shall be a corn of wheat in the earth on the top of the mountains." (3) It is specified as "firstfruits." As the firstborn of every animal was the Lord's (Exod. xii. 29; xiii. 12, 13; Numb. xviii. 16), so did he claim the vegetable firstfruits. And as Christ is "the Firstborn of every creature" (Col. i. 15), the Anti-type of every firstborn,—so is he the Firstfruits of everything in the creation. Through him all things are blessed to our use and benefit. (4) In this character Jesus will come out in full form in the resurrection. He is the "First-begotten from the dead" (Rev. i. 5). The "Firstfruits of them that slept" and still sleep (1 Cor. xv. 20, 23; 1 Thess. iv. 14). Thus is he "the Beginning [or Chief] of the [new] creation of God" (Rev. iii. 14). 2. *The treatment it received.* (1) The corn was dried by the fire. It was not allowed to dry gradually and gently in the air, but was violently scorched. Here was set forth expressively that fire of grief and sorrow which parched the soul of Jesus. The fires of his zeal for the glory of God, which was outraged by the sinfulness of men, entered into his very soul (Ps. cxix. 139). So did the corresponding flames of sympathy for that humanity which he had so wondrously assumed; consuming, because of its sinfulness, under the fires of God's anger. (2) It was beaten. This threshing of the wheat represented the severity with which Jesus was treated, (a) in the court of Caiaphas; (b) in the hall of Pilate; (c) at the place called Calvary (Isa. liii. 5, 8).

II. THINGS COMMON TO THE FIRSTFRUITS AND OTHER FORMS OF THE MINCHAH. 1. *It was offered upon the altar of burnt offerings.* (1) Touching the altar, it became a sacrifice to God. (2) Consumed in the fire, it was accepted by God. 2. *It was offered with oil.* (1) The natural use of this was that the offering thereby became more readily consumed. The flame of oil is bright and fervent. (2) This was a symbol of the Holy Spirit's grace, which without measure rested upon Christ (see Ps. lxix. 9; John ii. 17). 3. *It was offered with frankincense.* (1) The physical use of this would be to take away from the tabernacle the smell of a slaughter-house, and to fill the courts with a grateful odour. (2) The spiritual use was to prefigure the fragrance of the merits of Jesus, (a) in his sacrifice (Eph. v. 2); (b) in his intercession (Rev. viii. 3, 4). Thus the offensiveness of the flesh in us is destroyed, and the living sacrifice becomes acceptable (Rom. xii. 1).—J. A. M.

Vers. 1-16.—*Our recognition of the hand of God in the blessings of life.* The fact that the law of the meat offering follows that of the burnt offering is itself significant. It suggests—

I. THE TRUE ORDER OF THE DIVINE LIFE IN MAN. It is, indeed, a mistake for the human teacher to attempt to lay down precise lines of thought and feeling along which souls must move. "The progress of religion in the soul" varies with individual experience. The action of God's Spirit is not limited, and while we should seek to lead all souls to walk in the road by which we are travelling, we should not be anxious that they should tread in our own steps. On the other hand, there is an order of thought and experience which may not be inverted. First the burnt offering, then the meat offering; first the soul's presentation of itself as a sinner to ask forgiveness and to offer itself to God, then the service of recognition of him and gratitude for his gifts. It is a serious, and may be a fatal, spiritual error to attempt to gain God's favour by doing those things which are appropriate to his children, without having first sought and found reconciliation through a crucified Saviour. Start at the starting-point of the Christian course, lest, when the goal is reached, the crown be not placed upon the brow.

II. OUR GRATEFUL RECOGNITION OF GOD'S CONSTANT GOODNESS TO US. The meat offering was a sacrifice in which the worshipper acknowledged that the various blessings of his life came from God and belonged to him. He brought fine flour (ver. 1), and oil (ver. 1), also wine as the accompanying drink offering (ch. xxiii. 13). The chief

produce of the land, the principal elements of food were, in a sacred hour, at the holy place, and, by a pious action, solemnly recognized as gifts of God, to be gratefully accepted from his hand, to be reverently laid on his altar. We are thankfully to acknowledge: 1. *God's kindness in supplying us with that which we need.* Bread (corn) will stand for that food which is requisite, and when we consider the goodness of our Creator, (1) in originally providing that which is so wholesome and nourishing to all men; (2) in multiplying it so freely that there is abundance for all; (3) in causing it to be multiplied in such a way as ministers to our moral and spiritual health (through our intelligence, activity, co-operation, etc.); (4) in making palatable and pleasurable the daily meals which would otherwise be (as sickness occasionally proves) intolerably burdensome;—we have abundant reason for blessing God for his kindness in respect of the necessities of life. 2. *His goodness in providing us with that which is superfluous.* A very large part of the enjoyment of our life is in the use of that which is not necessary but agreeable; in the appropriation of that which is pleasant,—the exquisite, the harmonious, the fragrant, the delicately beautiful, etc. This also is of God. He “makes our cup to run over;” from him come the fruits and the flowers, as well as the corn and the grass. Nay, he has closely associated the superfluous with the necessary in nature as in human life. The common potato does not grow without bearing a beautiful flower, nor the humble bean without yielding a fragrant odour. As the Hebrew brought his oil and his wine to the altar of gratitude, so should we bring our thanksgiving for the delicacies, adornments, and sweetmesses which come from the bountiful hand of Heaven.

III. THE NECESSITY FOR PURITY IN OUR SERVICE. There might not be leaven nor honey (ver. 11); there must be salt (ver. 13). Everything associated with corruption must be avoided; that which was antiseptic in its nature should be introduced; “nothing which defileth” before him; the “clean hands and the pure heart” in “the holy place” (Ps. xxiv. 3, 4). (See “Purity in worship,” *infra.*)

IV. THE ACCEPTABLENESS OF OUR GRATITUDE TO GOD. All the frankincense was to be consumed on the altar, and the burning of the other offerings with this fragrant incense accompanying it betokened that it was, as stated, a “sweet savour unto the Lord” (vers. 2, 12). God is not to be worshipped with men’s hands, as though “he needed anything” (Acts xvii. 25); but he takes delight in his children: 1. Realizing his presence. 2. Recognizing his hand in their comforts and their joy. 3. Responding to his fatherly love with their filial gratitude and praise.

V. THE WHOLESALE INFLUENCE OF GRATEFUL SERVICE ON OUR OWN HEARTS. He who “knows what is in man,” warned his people against saying in their heart, “My power and the might of my hand hath gotten me this wealth” (Deut. viii. 17). Such a sacrifice as that of the meat offering—a service of grateful acknowledgment of God’s hand—is fitted to render us the greatest spiritual benefit, by: 1. Helping us to keep a humble heart before God. 2. Causing us to be filled with the pure joy of gratitude instead of being puffed up with the mischievous complacency of pride.—C.

Vers. 11—13.—*Purity in worship.* When the Hebrew worshipper had presented his burnt offering, had sought forgiveness of sin, and had dedicated himself to God in sacred symbolism, he then brought of the produce of the land, of that which constituted his food, and by presenting flour, oil, and wine, with frankincense, he owned his indebtedness to Jehovah. In engaging in this last act of worship, he was to do that which spoke emphatically of purity in approaching the Holy One of Israel. By Divine direction he was—

I. CAREFULLY TO EXCLUDE THAT IN WHICH THERE WAS ANY ELEMENT OF IMPURITY. Leaven is “a substance in a state of putrefaction;” honey “soon turns sour, and even forms vinegar.” These were, therefore, expressly interdicted; they might not be laid on the altar of God. But so important was this feature that positive as well as negative rules were laid down. The offerer was—

II. CONSTANTLY TO INTRODUCE THE CORRECTIVE OF IMPURITY. “Neither shalt thou suffer the salt . . . to be lacking;” “with all thine offerings thou shalt offer salt.” Salt is the great preservative from putrefaction, fitting type of all that makes pure in symbolic worship.

When we come up to the house of the Lord to “offer the sacrifice of praise” or to engage in any act of devotion, we must remember that—

I. GOD LAYS GREAT STRESS ON THE PURITY OF OUR HEART IN WORSHIP. Only the pure in heart can see God (Matt. v. 8). Without holiness no man shall see him (Heb. xii. 14). They must be clean who bear the vessels of the Lord (Isa. lii. 11). None may ascend his holy hill but "he that hath clean hands and a pure heart." "If we regard iniquity in our heart, the Lord will not hear us" (Ps. lxvi. 18). We have not now laid down for us any precise directions as to what words we shall use, what forms we shall adopt, what gifts we shall devote, but we know that the chief thing to bring, that without which all is vain, is a right spirit, a pure heart, a soul that is seeking God and longing for his likeness. The interdiction of the leaven and honey, and the requirement of salt, suggest that—

II. GOD DESIRES A VIGILANT EXCLUSION OF EVERY UNHOLY THOUGHT WHEN WE DRAW NIGH TO HIM. We may be tempted to allow corruption to enter into and mar our worship or our Christian work, in the form of: 1. An unworthy spirit of rivalry. 2. An ostentation of piety. 3. Self-seeking by securing the favour of man. 4. Sensuous enjoyment (mere artistic appreciation, etc.). 5. A spirit of dislike or resentment towards fellow-worshippers or fellow-workers. Such spiritual "leaven" must not be brought to the altar; such sentiments must be shut out from the soul. We must strenuously resist when these evil thoughts would enter. We must vigorously and energetically expel them if they find their way within the heart (Prov. iv. 23).

III. GOD DESIRES THE PRESENCE OF THE PURIFYING THOUGHT IN DEVOTION. There must not only be the absence of leaven, but the presence of salt; not only the absence of that which corrupts and spoils, but the presence of that which purifies. There must be the active presence of sanctifying thoughts. Such are: 1. A profound sense of the nearness of God to us. 2. A lively sense of our deep indebtedness to Jesus Christ. Let these convictions fill the soul, and the lower and ignobler sentiments will fail to enter or will quickly leave. If we feel our own feebleness and incapacity, we may fall back on the truth that—

IV. GOD HAS PROMISED THE AID OF HIS CLEANSING SPIRIT. We must pray for "the renewing of the Holy Ghost" (Titus iii. 5); that he will "cleanse us from our sin;" will give us "truth in the inward parts;" will make us "clean," "whiter than snow;" will "create in us a clean heart, and renew a right spirit within us" (Ps. li.; and see Ps. xix. 12-14; cxxxix. 23, 24).—C.

Vers. 3-10.—*Priest and people: reciprocal services.* Two things are stated in the Law concerning the priesthood.

I. THAT EVERY POSSIBLE THING WAS DONE TO IMPART TO THEM PECULIAR SANCTITY. They were separated and sanctified by various ceremonies and services.

II. THAT SPECIAL SANCTITY WAS ASSOCIATED IN THE MINDS OF THE PEOPLE WITH THEIR PERSON AND OFFICE. So much so that offerings given to them were lawfully regarded as presented to Jehovah. In the meat offering "the remnant" (the greater part) was to be "Aaron's and his sons," and this is declared to be "a thing most holy." To these statements we may add—

III. THAT WHILE THEIR NEARNESS TO GOD CONFERRED SPECIAL PRIVILEGE, IT DID NOT ENSURE PERSONAL HOLINESS (ch. x. 1; 1 Sam. ii. 17, 23; Mal. i. 6-10; ii. 1-9).

IV. THAT IN PROPORTION TO THEIR PERSONAL EXCELLENCE WOULD BE THE OFFERINGS OF THE PEOPLE. Few meat offerings would be brought whereby a rapacious, or arrogant, or impure, or unsocial, or irreverent priesthood would be benefited; but free and full offerings would come to the altar where blameless, beloved, and honoured men were ministering.

The Christian ministry is unlike the Jewish priesthood in that: 1. It is not hereditary; it is (or should be) only entered upon where there is individual fitness for the office. 2. It offers no sacrifices (Heb. x. 11, 12). 3. It approaches God with men rather than for them. Yet it is like that ancient priesthood, in that it is a section of God's people set apart for conducting Divine worship and for the service of society in all sacred things. We are reminded—

I. THAT IT IS THE WILL OF CHRIST THAT CHRISTIAN MINISTERS SHOULD BE SUSTAINED BY THE PEOPLE'S OFFERINGS (1 Cor. ix. 11, 13, 14).

II. THAT WHAT IS PRESENTED TO THEM FOR THEIR WORK'S SAKE, CHRIST COUNTS AS OFFERED TO HIMSELF (Matt. x. 40, 41; Phil. iv. 18).

**III. THAT IN THE RELATIONS OF MINISTER AND PEOPLE THERE SHOULD BE RECIPROCAL GENEROSITY.** On the part of the latter let there be: 1. Full appreciation of the high nature and the large number of their services. 2. Generous overlooking of lesser faults, remembering human frailty. 3. Constant credit for purity of motive. 4. Active sympathy and co-operation; and 5. Substantial practical support. He who has "the burden of the Lord" upon his heart should not be weighed down with temporal anxieties. On the part of the former, let there be: 1. Complete subordination of temporal to spiritual solicitudes. 2. Free and generous expenditure of love and strength, both on individual souls in special need, and on the Church and the world. Reciprocal indifference and closeness will end in leanness of soul; reciprocal love and generosity in largeness of heart and nobility of life (Luke vi. 38).—C.

**Vers. 1—3.—*The meat offering.*** The offering of meat or food, consisting of fine flour, with frankincense, cakes and wafers, parched grain, suited to all classes. The general meaning was probably *eucharistic*. A portion of bread, firstfruits, offered in the fire as a memorial of Divine goodness and pledge of the future life. Several particulars noticeable. 1. It was what made part of the daily meal of the house. 2. Frankincense mingled with it, and oil poured upon it; the prayers and thankful worship of the offerer, which were the work of God's Spirit, returned to him. 3. It was partly consumed by fire, and partly "a thing most holy," or set apart to the Lord, eaten by the priests, supporting the temple worship. 4. If baked, no leaven in it nor honey, no corruption, a pure sacrifice. 6. Every offering seasoned with salt, "the salt of the covenant of thy God," i.e. the emblem of Divine grace, which, while it accepts man's obedience, overlooks and pardons its imperfection.—R.

**Vers. 4—16.—*The various kinds of meat offerings.*** Without dwelling on every minute regulation, the following main points may be distinguished as representative.

**I. OFFERED FOOD.** Acknowledgment of dependence. Praise for life and its gifts. Joys and pleasures should be consecrated. The will of God in them and over them. Family worship a duty. Recognition of God in common life. Firstfruits are God's, not the remnant or gleanings of our faculties and opportunities, but all.

**II. OFFERING DIVIDED BETWEEN OFFERER AND PRIESTS.** Connection of daily labour and its results with the sanctuary and religious duties. The secular and sacred only nominally distinct. The house of God and the house of man should open into one another. Nothing should be allowed to interfere with the holiness of that which is assigned to God's service in the sanctuary. "*It is most holy.*" Too often Christians fall into a carelessness with respect to sacred appointments which reacts on the spirit and life. Our partnership with God involves responsibility.

**III. NO LEAVEN, NO HONEY.** In all things purity and humility. There must be no corrupt principle admitted into our service of God. The doctrine must be purified of leaven. The motives must be examined. We ought not to serve God for the sake of filthy lucre, under the influence of mere sensational excitement. Truth and sobriety in worship.

**IV. SALT WITH EVERY SACRIFICE.** All must be brought to God in the spirit of penitent faith. Salt preserves life, sets forth the dependence of man upon God. The gracious covenant is the source of all. He who commands is himself the giver of all power to fulfil his word. He is the Alpha and the Omega of the spiritual life.

**V. FRANKINCENSE AND OIL.** Fragrance and brightness. Heaven and earth mingled together. Reconciliation of God and man. The outpoured spirit of light and life. Joy in God and in his gifts. The anointing oil mingled in the fire and increased the flame. The Messiah is the true Anointed One. Every Israelite, in a lower degree, was himself a Messiah, an anointed one, taken up into the Son of God and blessed. The people are a holy, consecrated people, separated unto Jehovah. Every individual act of religion is acceptable as the oil of the Spirit is poured upon it. What a new view of life can thus be obtained! Make all a meat offering to the Lord.—R.

## EXPOSITION.

## CHAPTER III.

**THE PEACE OFFERING.** The peace offering, though the instructions here given respecting it precede those relating to the sin offering (for a reason to be stated hereafter), is the last in order of the sacrifices when they were all presented together. First, the sin offering taught the need of, and symbolically wrought, propitiation and atonement; next the burnt offering represented the absolute surrender of man's will to God's will; then the meat offering, by its gift of homage, declared the loyal submission of the offerer; and then followed the peace offering, symbolizing the festive joy which pervades the souls of those who are in communion with God. The essential characteristic of the peace offering is the feast upon the sacrifice, participated in symbolically by God (by means of the part consumed on the altar, and the part eaten by his ministers) and actually by the offerer and his companions. It served as a memorial to the Israelites of the institution of the covenant between God and themselves (a covenant in the East being ordinarily ratified by the parties to it eating together), and reminded them of the blessings thence derived, which naturally called forth feelings of joyous thankfulness; while it prefigured the peace wrought for man by the adoption in Christ, through which he has communion with God.

Ver. 1.—**Peace offering, Zebach shelamim,** “sacrifice of peace offerings.” The singular, *shelam*, occurs once (Amos v. 22). The conditions to be fulfilled by a Jew who offered a peace offering were the following:—1. He must bring either (1) a young bull or cow, or (2) a young sheep of either sex, or (3) a young he-goat or she-goat. 2. He must offer it in the court of the tabernacle. 3. In offering it he must place, or lean, his hand upon its head. 4. He must kill it at the door of the tabernacle. 5. He must provide three kinds of cakes similar to those offered in the meat offering, and leavened bread (ch. vii. 11—13). The priest had: 1. To catch the blood, and strike the sides of the altar with it, as in the burnt sacrifices. 2. To place upon the burnt offering, smouldering upon the altar, all the internal fat of the animal's body, together with the kidneys

enveloped in it, and, in the case of the sheep, the fat tails, for consumption by the fire. 3. To offer one of each of the three different kinds of unleavened cakes, and one loaf of the leavened bread, as a heave offering. 4. To wave the breast of the animal backwards and forwards, and to heave the leg or haunch upwards and downwards, in token of consecration (see notes on ch. vii. 14, 30, 31). 5. To take for his own eating, and that of his brethren the priests, the three cakes and loaf and haunch that had been heaved and waved. 6. To return the rest of the animal, and the remaining cakes and loaves, to the offerer, to serve as a feast for him and his, to be eaten the same or the next day, in the court of the tabernacle. The lesson taught by the peace offering was the blessedness of being in union with God as his covenant people, and the duty and happiness of exhibiting a joyous sense of this relation by celebrating a festival meal, eaten reverently and thankfully in the house of God, a part of which was given to God's priests, and a part consumed symbolically by God himself. The burnt offering had typified self-surrender; the meat offering, loyal submission; the peace offering typified the joyous cheerfulness of those who, having in a spirit of perfect loyalty surrendered themselves to God, had become his children, and were fed at the very board at which he deigned symbolically to partake. The most essential part of the meat offering was the presentation; of the burnt offering, the consumption of the victim on the altar; of the peace offering, the festive meal upon the sacrifice. The combined burnt and meat offering was the sacrifice of one giving himself up to God; the peace offering, that of one who, having given himself up to God, is realizing his communion with him. In this respect the peace offering of the old dispensation foreshadows the Lord's Supper in the new dispensation. Several other names have been proposed for the peace offering, such as thank offering, salvation offering, etc. No name is more suitable than peace offering, but the word must be understood not in the sense of an offering to bring about peace, but an offering of those who are in a state of peace, answering to the Greek word *εἰρήνη*, rather than to the Latin word *pacifica*. “A state of peace and friendship with God was the basis and *sine qua non* to the presentation of a *shelam*, and the design of that presentation, from which its name was derived, was the realization, establishment, verification, and enjoyment of the existing relations

of peace, friendship, fellowship, and blessedness" (Kurtz, 'Sacrificial Worship').

Vers. 3, 4.—"There were four parts to be burned upon the altar: (1) the fat that covereth the inwards, i.e. the large net, *omentum*, *πιτταῦος*, caul, or adipose membrane found in mammals, attached to the stomach and spreading over the bowels, and which in the ruminants abounds with fat; (2) all the fat which is upon the inwards, i.e. the fat attached to the intestines, and which could be peeled off; (3) the two kidneys, and the fat that is on them, which is by the flanks, or loins, i.e. the kidneys and all the fat connected with them; the kidneys are the only thing to be burnt except the fat; (4) the smaller net, *omentum minus*, or *caul* above the liver, which stretches on one side to the region of the kidneys, hence on the kidneys; 'by' = by them, not *with* them" (Gardiner).

Ver. 5.—Upon the burnt sacrifice. The peace offering is to be placed upon the burnt offering previously laid upon the fire. Symbolically and actually the burnt offering serves as the foundation of the peace offering. Self-surrender leads to peace; and the self-sacrifice of Christ is the cause of the peace subsisting between God and man.

Ver. 9.—The whole rump should no doubt be the whole tail, consisting chiefly of fat,

and always regarded as a great delicacy in the East (see Herod., iii. 113; Thompson, 'Land and the Book,' p. 97). The burning of the fat tail upon the altar, together with the internal fat, is the only point in which the ritual to be used when offering a sheep (vers. 6—11) differs from that used in offering a bull or cow (vers. 1—5), or a goat (vers. 12—16).

Ver. 11.—It is the food of the offering made by fire unto the Lord; literally, *It is the bread of the offering by fire to the Lord*. The idea of the peace offering being that of a meal at God's board, the part of the animal presented to God upon the altar is regarded as his share of the feast, and is called his food or bread. Cf. Rev. iii. 20, "I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me."

Ver. 17.—Eat neither fat nor blood. These are forbidden to be eaten, as belonging to God. The fat, that is, the internal fat, is his portion in the common feast of the peace offering, and the blood is presented to him in all the animal sacrifices, as the material vehicle of life (see ch. vii. 22—27). The remaining regulations as to the various sorts of the peace offerings, the priests' portions of them, and the festive meal on the sacrifices, are given in ch. vii. 11—34.

### HOMILETICS.

Vers. 1—17.—*The peace offering* was not a sacrifice denoting self-devotion like the burnt-offering, nor a tender of homage like the meat offering, but a feast upon a sacrifice, which God and man symbolically joined in partaking of. The offering consisted of an animal and unleavened cakes and (generally) leavened bread, of which a share was given to God's altar and priests on the one hand, and to the offerer and his friends on the other. It represented the blessedness and joyousness of communion between God and man. "The character of these feasts cannot be mistaken. It was that of joyfulness tempered by solemnity, of solemnity tempered by joyfulness. The worshipper had submitted to God an offering from his property; he now received back from him a part of the dedicated gift, and thus experienced anew the same gracious beneficence which had enabled him to appear with his wealth before the altar. He therefore consumed that portion with feelings of humility and thankfulness; but he was bidden at once to manifest those blissful sentiments by sharing the meat, not only with his household, which thereby was reminded of the Divine protection and mercy, but also with his needy fellow-beings, whether laymen or servants of the temple. Thus these beautiful repasts were stamped both with religious emotion and human virtue. The relation of friendship between God and the offerer which the sacrifice exhibited, was expressed and sealed by the feast, which intensified that relation into one of an actual covenant; the momentary harmony was extended to a permanent union. And these notions could not be expressed more intelligibly, at least to an Eastern people, than by a common meal, which to them is the familiar image of friendship and communion, of cheerfulness and joy" (Kalisch).

I. IT WAS A FEDERAL FEAST, REMINDING THE ISRAELITES OF THE INSTITUTION OF THE COVENANT. In early times the method of making a covenant was dividing animals in halves and passing between them (see Gen. xv. 9, 10; Jer. xxxiv. 18, 19), or otherwise offering them in sacrifice (Gen. viii. 20; xv. 9; Ps. l. 5), and then feasting together.

When Abraham's servant asked for Rebekah for his master, he refused to eat and drink until he had made his agreement (Gen. xxiv. 33); but after it was completed, "they did eat and drink, he and the men that were with him" (Gen. xxiv. 54). Jacob held a solemn feast after he and Laban had made a covenant together (Gen. xxxi. 54). The feast upon the peace offerings, whether offered by the whole congregation or by individuals, served as a memorial of the covenant made between God and their fathers (see Exod. xxiv. 5, where the name peace offering is first used), and it made them rejoice in being God's peculiar people in union and communion with him.

II. IT LOOKED FORWARD AS WELL AS BACKWARDS. Like the Passover, it at once commemorated an historical event and prefigured a blessing to come. The Passover looked backwards to the deliverance from Egypt, and forward to "Christ our passover sacrificed for us;" and in like manner the peace offering feast commemorated the making of the covenant, and prefigured the blessed state of communion to be brought about by the sacrifice of the cross. Communion is typified and proved in the New Testament as well as the Old by eating and drinking together (Luke xiv. 15; Acts x. 41; Rev. xix. 9).

III. SACRIFICE IN RELATION TO CHRISTIANS. We have no sin offering to offer. The full, perfect, and sufficient Sacrifice for sins was made once for all upon the cross; we have only to appropriate the merits of that one offering by faith. Nor have we a burnt offering to offer. The full surrender of himself by a perfect Man was once for all made in the Garden of Gethsemane and on Calvary; we can but follow the great Example. But we may still offer the meat offering, in a spiritual sense, by giving the service which declares us to be faithful subjects of God; and we may spiritually offer the peace offering, whenever with grateful hearts we offer praise and thanksgiving to God for having brought us into union and communion with himself.

IV. THE HOLY COMMUNION IS THE SPECIAL MEANS OF OUR EXHIBITING THE JOYOUS SENSE OF BEING THE CHILDREN OF GOD. It is not a sin offering, being neither a repetition nor a continuation, but a commemoration, of the great Sin Offering of the cross; it is not, therefore, propitiatory. Neither is it a burnt offering, for Christ's self-surrender cannot be reiterated or renewed, but only commemorated. But it answers to the meat offering, inasmuch as in it we offer our alms and "the creatures of bread and wine" as tokens of our loyalty, and receive back in requital "the strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the Body and Blood of Christ." And it is a peace offering, for therein we feast at God's board, exhibiting our joyful thankfulness for having been admitted into covenant with him, offering "our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," and rejoicing in the assurance thus given us "that we are very members incorporate in the mystical body of" Christ our Lord.

V. THE BLESSEDNESS OF A SENSE OF PEACE WITH GOD. First, we must feel the need of reconciliation, and a desire to rid ourselves of the obstacles in the way of it. Then we must go to Christ to have our sins nailed to his cross; and thus, "being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ" (Rom. v. 1), "and the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, shall keep our hearts and minds through Christ Jesus" (Phil. iv. 7), "and the God of peace shall be with us" (Phil. iv. 9).

#### HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

*Fellowship with God and man as illustrated in the peace offering.* Ch. iii.; also vii. 11—21, 28—34; xix. 6—8; xxii. 29, 30; cf. 1 John i. 6, 7; John vi. 33. We have found in the burnt offering the principle of entire *personal consecration*, and in the meat offering that of *consecrated life-work*. We have seen how these have their perfect fulfilment only in the case of Jesus Christ, while in other cases they are preceded by an acknowledgment of sin and shortcoming, and of acceptance as coming through another. In the peace offering we have a further stage of religious experience. Part of the sacrifice, whatever it may be, is burned on the altar, part is assigned to the priests, and part is returned to the offerer, to constitute the staple of a social feast. Moreover, the portion laid upon the altar is expressly called "the bread of God" (תְּבָדֵל תְּמִימָן בָּרֵךְ), ver. 11. Hence the idea of the offering is that God and his mediating

priests and his sacrificing servants are all partaking of the one animal, the one food ; that is to say, are all *in fellowship*. This is the crown of religious experience—conscious fellowship with God and with one another. It is what John refers to when he says, “If we say that we have fellowship with him, and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not the truth : but if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin” (1 John i. 6, 7).

I. IN HOLDING FELLOWSHIP WITH GOD AND MAN LARGE LIBERTY OF SELECTION IS ALLOWED. The animal presented might be a female or a male, and even, in the case of a free-will offering, an animal might be presented which had something superfluous (ch. xxii. 23). For, if fellowship is to be expressed, then, provided God is presented with what is perfect, what remains to represent man's share in the fellowship might fairly enough be imperfect. This wider range of selection emphasizes surely the fact that we may hold fellowship with God through any legitimate thing. We shall presently indicate the subject-matter of fellowship with God ; meanwhile it is well to notice the large selection allowed.

II. IT IS A PRELIMINARY OF FELLOWSHIP WITH GOD TO ACKNOWLEDGE SIN AND RECEIVE ACCEPTANCE THROUGH A SUBSTITUTE. God's rights are thus respected and acknowledged as our Moral Governor. To venture into the charmed circle of fellowship without the benefit of the bloodshedding is to presume before God. Hence the peace offering was done to death, and its blood sprinkled on the altar before the feast began. The fellowship with God, which has not been preceded on the part of sinners like ourselves by confession of sin and acceptance, is sure to be hollow at the best.

III. IN ANY FELLOWSHIP WITH GOD WE MUST RECOGNIZE HIS RIGHT TO THE BEST PORTION OF THE FEAST. The priest was directed to take the fat that covereth the inwards, and all the fat that is upon the inwards, with the kidneys and the lobe of the liver, and, in case of a sheep, the tail of fat, and he was to burn all these upon the altar of burnt offering, in the ashes of the burnt offering. This was recognizing God's right to the best portion—to the *hos carnis*, the “tit-bits,” as we would call them. Now, it is only natural to suppose that, whatever be the subject-matter of our fellowship with God he will enter more fully into the fellowship and make more of it than we can do. This will be more apparent when we notice in the sequel the different legitimate subjects of fellowship.

IV. IN FELLOWSHIP WITH ONE ANOTHER, MOREOVER, WE MUST RECOGNIZE THE POSSIBILITY OF OTHERS ENTERING INTO THE SUBJECT MORE FULLY THAN OURSELVES. The priestly class had the wave breast and heave leg assigned to them as their share. Next to God's portion, these were the best portions of the beast. It indicated plainly the liberal scale of “ministerial support” which God would foster, and it prompted the self-denial of true fellowship. For a feast is a poor thing in which the host retains the best things for himself. His pleasure should be to confer the best on others. For the time being he literally “esteems others better than himself.”

V. LET US NOW INDICATE THE LEGITIMATE SUBJECT-MATTERS FOR FELLOWSHIP WHICH ARE TYPIFIED IN THE PEACE OFFERINGS. Here, then, we have three sets of individuals partaking of the one organic whole—God on his altar, his mediating priests at the tabernacle, and the offerer and his friends. What does the organic whole represent ? And the only answer is, what God and man *can have fellowship about*. This evidently includes a very wide range indeed.

1. *Jesus Christ*. He is the great subject-matter of fellowship as between God and man, and between man and man. Hence he is called “the bread of God” which came down from heaven, the bread on which, so to speak, God feeds, as well as the bread he gives to nourish the world. If we think for a moment of the supreme delight which God the Father takes in his well-beloved Son, it is only faintly imaged by the portions placed upon the altar. What fellowship must God have in looking down upon his Son dedicated to life and death to redeem and sustain a sinful race ! Indeed, we cannot enter into such an unparalleled experience ; no wonder it should be said, “All the fat is the Lord's.” Yet this does not prevent us on our part from feasting joyfully and by faith upon Jesus. He becomes the subject-matter of our fellowship and joy.

2. *God's Word*. This is another subject-matter of fellowship. How often does God use it in communicating with our souls ! and is it not the choicest phraseology we can

find in returning his fellowship through prayer? How much more, besides, does God see in the Word, and get out of it, than we do! If the crucible of criticism is only revealing the splendours of the Word, how much more must God see in it! "Thy word is very pure, therefore thy servants love it."

3. *Ourselfs.* For fellowship is having something in common with another. If, then, we are altogether consecrated to God, if we say from the heart, "Lord, we are thine; undertake for us," we become, so to speak, the medium of fellowship as between God and us. God's delight in us is beyond conception. "The Lord taketh pleasure in them that fear him, in them that hope in his mercy." And, as we realize God's right and delight in us, life becomes a joyful feast to us. The exercise of all our powers becomes a conscious joy, a feast of love, and all around us are the better for our being.

4. *Every legitimate subject or engagement.* For all may be made subject-matter of fellowship with God. Nothing worth living for but may be made the medium of communion with him. All learning will prove more delightful if undertaken with God. All social engagements will prove more enjoyable if spent with God. Every occupation, in fact, becomes increasingly blissful in proportion to our fellowship with God in it. It is the feast of life: he sups with us, and enables us to sup with him (Rev. iii. 20).

5. *Every blessing received and vow registered.* For this peace offering was either the expression of praise for some mercy received or the covenant-sign of some fresh resolution. It corresponded very largely to our Eucharistic celebrations. Just as in feasting upon the symbols of our Saviour's dying love we hold fellowship with God and with each other in thinking of all we have received and all we now resolve, so was it in the older feast. The offerer, as he entertained his friends, rejoiced in the goodness he had got from God, and pledged himself in gratitude. The peace offering thus expresses the truth regarding the fellowship possible between God and man, and between the brotherhood.—R. M. E.

Vers. 1-5.—*A general view of offerings.* A supplementary account of the manner in which the peace offerings are to be presented unto the Lord is contained in ch. vii. Reserving fuller distinct consideration of them till our arrival there, it may be instructive now to derive some general lessons from a comparison between this present chapter and the preceding chapters, which tell us of the burnt and meat offerings.

I. EACH SEASON AND CIRCUMSTANCE HAS ITS APPROPRIATE OFFERING. Different names are bestowed upon the offerings. A general name for all is *corban*, a gift, a means of approach. It may be "a burnt offering" (ch. i. 3), significant of entire dedication; or "an offering of an oblation" (ch. ii. 1), a present of flour or grains, an acknowledgment of God's goodness, and an expression of desire to obtain his good will; or "a sacrifice of peace" (ch. iii. 1), denoting a wish to live in concord with Jehovah, recognizing his will and enjoying his favour. Thus the devout Israelite could never be without a fitting means of approach, whatever his state of mind or whatever the crisis in his life. So we may always have something to offer our heavenly Father, whether in suffering or health, in adversity or prosperity, in age or youth, desiring increased sanctification, or blessing, or usefulness, whether thankful for the past or requesting grace for the future. Even the one atonement of Jesus Christ, like a prism that exhibits different colours according to our position, may appear a diversified offering, according as the pressing need of the moment may seem to be deliverance from wrath, peace, happiness, self-dedication, temporal prosperity, or the light of God's countenance.

II. BY THE DIFFERENCE IN OFFERINGS GOD SEEKS TO AWAKEN AND DEVELOP DIFFERENT MORAL SENTIMENTS. Our chequered experience has its part to fulfil in calling into play every faculty of the mind and spirit. God likes a good "all-round" character, strong at all points, and only exercise can secure this. He would have his people attend to all the requirements of the Christian life, to manifest all the virtues, knowledge and faith, gratitude and hope, patience and vigour. We must not deem any voyage or journey superfluous; no accident but may benefit us; the holiness meeting, the evangelistic service, the workers' conference,—each may be profitable in turn.

III. ONE OFFERING DOES NOT INTERFERE WITH THE PRESENTATION OF ANOTHER OF A DIFFERENT KIND. In ver. 5 we read that the fat of the peace offering is placed

upon the burnt offering, probably upon the remains of the morning sacrifice. So that the one becomes a foundation for the other, and clashing is obviated. The sacrifice of the congregation does not prevent the sacrifice of the individual, nor does the general offering prove a hindrance to the special. Family prayer is no obstacle to private supplication, nor does the stated worship of the sanctuary exclude extraordinary gatherings. The fear of some good people lest regular meditation and service should grow formal and check any outburst of enthusiasm, or any sudden prompting to special effort, is seen to be groundless.

IV. CERTAIN REGULATIONS ARE COMMON TO ALL OFFERINGS. *Burning on the altar* belongs to bloody and unbloody sacrifices, death and sprinkling of blood of necessity only to the former. In every case the offering must be of *the best of its kind*, if an animal "without blemish," if of grain "fine flour." What we say or do for God should be with our might; in whatever service for him we engage, it must be with full affection and earnest zeal. And every sacrifice required *the mediation of a priest*. Christ must be the inspiration of our acts, the way of acceptance consecrating all our gifts of money, strength, and time. By him we die (as did the sentient victim) to the world, by him we live to the glory of God.—S. R. A.

Vers. 16, 17.—*Jehovah's portion*. As the Author of life and the Giver of all bounty, God might have claimed the whole of every sacrifice. But he discriminated between the parts of the victim, sometimes reserving for himself the greater share, at other times only a small proportion of that presented to him. In the peace offering there was selected for the altar, as God's perquisite, the "fat" of the animal, and the remainder went to the priests and the offerer.

I. LEARN THAT NOT THE MEANEST BUT THE CHOICEST PORTIONS MUST BE RESERVED FOR GOD'S SERVICE. Low conceptions of his majesty and perfection lead to such religious observance as is an insult rather than an honour. To defer reading the Scriptures or prayer till the mind and body are fatigued, is an infraction of this rule. Let our freshest moments, our sweetest morsels of thought and power, be set apart for the Lord! And similarly, ask not, How near can I walk to the dividing line between the Church and the world? or, Which of my amusements can I with least self-denial renounce in order to do his will? May we not behold the same lesson inculcated in the distinction indicated in this chapter, between a peace and a burnt offering? The latter, being wholly devoted to the Lord, must consist of a male victim; the former, intended principally for the participation of the offerers, may be male or female (ver. 1). It cannot be right, then, to imagine that any qualifications will suffice for entire consecration to God's work. Ministers and missionaries should be numbered amongst men of highest intellect and intensest spirituality.

II. SEE HOW GOD ACCEPTS THE OFFERINGS OF HIS CREATURES AS THE MATERIALS FOR HIS DELIGHT AND GLORY. The burnt fat is "food" for the fire offering, and is termed in another place, the "bread of God." It becomes "a sweet savour" that is, eminently pleasing to the Holy One. In the word "food" we discern the purport of the peace offering as a sacrificial meal, in which, by returning to God what he had previously bestowed, the worshipper: 1. *Acknowledged his indebtedness and thanks*. 2. *Was made a guest at the table of the Lord*, inasmuch as he ate part of the animal that was "food for the fire offering"; and 3. *Had all his other provisions sanctified* for the sustenance of life, being allowed to consume the entire portions of animals not fit for sacrifice.

III. RECOLLECT THE OBLIGATORINESS OF DIVINE STATUTES. 1. *They prohibit as well as command*. "Thou shalt not" occupies as prominent a position in the Decalogue as "Thou shalt." Not only does man need both to try him (as with our first parents) and direct him, but one really involves the other. Observe that what man might not consume himself might be properly consumed on the altar; so the adoration and unquestioning fidelity that are out of place in reference to any finite beings, are becoming in relation to God. 2. *They are equally binding on all generations*. They respect us as well as our fathers, and herein the laws of God differ from the mutable proclamations of human lawgivers. The precepts of God only change with a new dispensation. This is the meaning of the word "perpetual." There is a sense, indeed, in which no Divine statute alters, being continued in spirit though the letter may have varied. 3. *They*

*enter into all phases of life.* The prohibition was to be acted upon in "the dwellings" as well as at the tabernacle. Let us not make too great a distinction between the homage of the house of God and the home or the workshop and the factory! It is the characteristic of the gospel times to have the Law written on the heart, so that we carry it with us wherever we go. Thus are we prevented from sinning against God.—S. R. A.

Vers. 1-5.—*The peace offering.* We may get a clear conception of the peace offering by noticing the points of difference between it and the burnt offering described in the first chapter of this book.

I. IT DIFFERS IN ITS TITLE. 1. *The burnt offering is in the Hebrew called (רָאשׁ) olah.* (1) This term comes from (רָאשׁ) *alah*, to ascend. The reason is that the whole animal was converted, by the action of the fire of the altar, into flame and sparks, vapour and smoke, in which forms it rose from the altar, and as it were *ascended* to God. (2) It described the completeness in which Christ offered himself to God in the flames of the "spirit of burning" (Heb. ix. 14). (3) It also sets forth how completely we should devote ourselves as living sacrifices to God (Rom. xii. 1), and how constantly our thoughts and affections should rise into the heavens (Phil. iii. 20; Col. iii. 1-3). 2. *This is called (שְׁלָמִים) shelamim.* (1) The verb from which this noun is derived is (שָׁלֹם) *shalem*, to complete or make whole; and the noun is well rendered *peace offering*. (2) It was, therefore, considered as making up that which was lacking in the sinner, in order to reconcile him to God. In cases of distress, peace offerings as well as burnt offerings were offered up (Judg. xx. 26). So are we "reconciled to God by the death of his Son." (3) In making covenants, or entering into the covenant, peace offerings were associated with burnt offerings in like manner (Exod. xxiv. 5). Paul manifestly alludes to the peace offering in Eph. ii. 14-19. "He is our peace" is equivalent to saying, "He is our peace offering."

II. IT DIFFERS IN ITS VICTIMS. 1. *In respect to the kinds.* (1) Three classes of animal were specified as proper for the holocaust: there were those of the herd; there were those of the flock; and there were those of the fowls. (2) In the peace offering there are only two. Animals from the herd and from the flock are specified, but there is no mention of turtle-doves or young pigeons here. The reason of this is that it would be difficult to treat fowls as peace offerings were treated in relation to the fat; and the animals are so small that if divided as peace offerings the portions would be small. There is thoughtful consideration for the welfare of his people in all the laws of God. 2. *In respect to the sexes.* (1) The animals devoted as burnt offerings were males. This is specified in relation to the burnt offering of the herd. Also to that of the flock. Masculine pronouns are used in relation to that of the fowls. The neuter, "it," ver. 15, should have been rendered "him" (see Hebrew text). (2) In respect to the peace offering, the matter of sex is optional. (3) The reason may be this. The burnt offering appears to have been partly an expression of adoration, in which it is proper to give to God all our strength and excellence. The peace offering was divided between God, the priests, and the offerer. Here, then, was a feast of *friendship*, and the sexes are helpful to our friendships.

III. IT DIFFERS IN THE TREATMENT OF ITS VICTIMS. 1. *There were points of agreement here.* (1) The offering must be without blemish. Acceptable service must be without blemish, and this can only be rendered to God through Christ (Jude 24, 25). (2) The hand of the offerer must be laid on the head of the offering. This was intended as a solemn transfer of sin, and acknowledgment that the suffering is vicarious. How graphically expressive of the faith of the sinner in the great Saviour! (3) The sacrifice must be killed at the door of the tabernacle. Christ is the door. There is no other entrance into the holy place of his Church on earth but by him. The holy led to the holiest. If we do not belong to his spiritual Church on earth, we cannot belong to his glorious Church in heaven. There was a visible Church near, but still, in the bulk of its members, *outside* the door! Still there are multitudes only in the outer courts. (4) The blood must be sprinkled upon the altar round about. It is by the *blood* of Jesus that we enter the "new and living way." 2. *But there were points of difference.* (1) Instead of the holocaust the fat only was offered here (vers. 3-5). The fat in the peace offering appears to correspond to the oil in the meat offering. (2) In this view it will represent those graces of the mind which are the fruits of the Spirit. (3) Burnt

offerings and peace offerings were consumed together (ver. 5). The great sacrifice of Christ prepares the altar for sacrifices of praise. These were not accepted till we were reconciled through him.—J. A. M.

Vers. 6—17.—*The peace offering of the flock.* The ceremony in relation to this is almost identical with that of the herd already described. Nevertheless, there are a few expressions in the course of the description which are not found in the former paragraph. We call attention to—

I. **THE DESCRIPTION OF THE FAT OF THE LAMB.** Vers. 8—10. 1. Note the expression, “*The fat thereof, and the whole rump.*” The “and” here is expletive rather than copulative, thus, “The fat thereof, *even* the whole rump.” But the “rump,” as vulgarly understood among us, is muscle, not fat. The part here indicated is the *tail*. This is evident from what follows, *viz.* “It shall be taken off hard by the back-bone.” The tail of the sheep even in our climate is fat, but in the East it is remarkably so, some of them weighing from twelve to forty pounds. 2. The portions burnt were *very inflammable*. (1) Here, in addition to the fat of the tail, was all the fat of the inwards, which in a sheep might weigh eight or ten pounds. This, when ignited, would be consumed, whatever else may have been laid upon the altar. (2) These parts were considered to be the seat of the animal passions. In this view the lesson of their consumption upon the altar would be that our passions should be in complete subjection to God. Also to impress upon us that, if not consumed in the milder fires of his love, how obnoxious they are to the fierce fires of his wrath! (3) The rapid consumption of the fat of lambs upon the altar is therefore appropriately used to describe the extermination of the wicked. “But the wicked shall perish, and the enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs: they shall consume; into smoke shall they consume away” (Ps. xxxvii. 20). Fire, it would seem, will be the chief instrument which Providence will summon for the destruction of the forces of Anti-christ (Rev. xvii. 16; xviii. 9; xix. 3, 20; xx. 9, 14).

II. **THE EXPRESSION, “FOOD OF THE OFFERING MADE BY FIRE UNTO THE LORD”** (ver. 11). 1. Thus, what was consumed by fire is called *God's food*. (1) Some construe this to mean that what is consumed is food for the fire. But this is to give no information. Nor would this be a sufficient reason for the prohibition of the fat as food for an Israelite (see vers. 16, 17). Note, the fat intermingled with the flesh was not forbidden, but those portions only which were prescribed to be offered upon the altar (see Neh. viii. 10). (2) But how could God be said to feast upon such food? Not literally, certainly (see Ps. l. 13). But figuratively. Thus his attributes of justice and mercy are, so to speak, hungry for satisfaction; and this satisfaction they find in that sacrifice of Christ, in virtue of which he is not only merciful, but just in justifying the ungodly (Rom. iii. 24—26). (3) To avail ourselves of this mercy of God, we must justify him, *viz.* by hearty repentance and true faith. While God magnifies his justice in his mercy, we, too, must magnify his justice in his mercy. 2. The portions of the peace offering not consumed upon the altar were *eaten by men*. (1) Here, then, was the expression of a fellowship between God and men, which is established through sacrifice. This glorious privilege is set forth also in the Christian Eucharist. We feast with the Lord at his table (1 Cor. x. 21). (2) Here also was fellowship between religious men. The priest had his portion, and the offerer his. That the offerer should feast with a Gentile would have been profanity. So the fellowship of Christians is with the holy universe (Heb. xii. 22—24).

III. **THE NOTE PROHIBITING THE EATING OF BLOOD.** Ver. 17. 1. What are the reasons for this? (1) The first is that the blood is the life of the flesh. The prohibition of blood as food is a Noachian precept, and this reason is given there. The object is to set a store upon life (see Gen. ix. 4—6). (2) The second is that blood is given upon the altar to make atonement for the soul, *viz.* life for the life (Lev. xvii. 10—14). The atoning blood of Christ must not be treated as a common thing (Heb. x. 29). 2. We may here refer to a circumstance in connection with the bleeding of the sacrifice. (1) The Jews tell us that the animal, after the slaughtering, was suspended on hooks near the place of rings for the removing of the skin. How suggestive of the hanging of Jesus upon the tree of his cross! (2) The next thing was the opening of the heart, to let the remaining blood escape. That this should happen to Christ was a special subject of

prophecy (Zech. xii. 10; John xix. 34). (3) To human appearance this prophecy seems to have been fulfilled as by accident. The same remark may be applied to the fulfilment of many prophecies. There are no mere accidents. The careful hand of an allwise Providence is in everything.—J. A. M.

Vers. 1-16.—*The foundation of fellowship with God.* The “sacrifice of peace-offering” was one of fellowship. Its distinctive features are brought out in ch. vii. (see Homily there). The sacrifice enjoined in this (third) chapter is preliminary to the sacred feast which was to follow. Its significance is found in the fact that the act of communion with God could only come after the oblation had been presented. We learn, therefore—

I. THAT SACRED JOY BEFORE GOD CAN ONLY FOLLOW RECONCILIATION WITH HIM. The Hebrew people might not come to the tabernacle and have a solemn feast near the sacred Presence until the animal had been slain and its blood sprinkled on the altar (vers. 1, 2, 8, 13). Conscious unworthiness must first be taken away by the shed blood of bull or lamb, and then priest and people might rejoice together before the Lord. First purity, then peace (Jas. iii. 17). We may aspire (1) to sit down with the people of God at the table here, or (2) to mingle with those who shall partake of the marriage supper of the Lamb hereafter; but there is no welcome from lips Divine until sin has been confessed and forgiven. First, penitence at the cross of the Redeemer and trust in his atoning sacrifice; then fellowship with God and his people.

II. THAT A FULL SELF-SURRENDER MUST PRECEDE THE ACT OF COMMUNION. When the animal had been slain, the priest was to present to God the fat, the kidneys, etc. (vers. 3, 4, 9, 10, 14, 15), special stress being laid on “the inwards;” the best and richest parts, those which had been the life of the animal, were offered to the Lord, as representing the animal itself, and so the offerer himself. He symbolically offered himself to God through these vital parts of the victim. When we draw near to a service of sacred fellowship and joy, or when we anticipate the communion of the skies, we should act on the truth that “our God has commanded our strength” (Ps. lxvii. 28), that the appeal for his mercy through Christ should be accompanied with a free, full surrender of our whole selves, the consecration of our very best, the “inward parts”—the understanding, the affections, the will—to him and his service.

III. THAT FAITH IN CHRIST AND THE CONSECRATION OF OURSELVES RESULT IN HIS PERFECT PLEASURE WITH US: “It is an offering . . . of a sweet savour unto the Lord” (vers. 5, 16). When the oblation was complete, then the offerer stood in the position of one who might rejoice in the Divine Presence and feast with the holy people and with God. Accepted in Christ, and having “yielded ourselves unto God” in unreserved consecration, we may feel that God’s good pleasure, his full Divine complacency, rests upon us; we may walk in the light of his reconciled countenance all the day long. Two supplementary truths offer themselves to our thought in these verses. 1. *That every soul must personally and spiritually engage in acceptable service.* The offerer was “to lay his hand on the head of the offering”—striking and significant act, by which he clearly intimated his consciousness of sin, and his desire that the victim might represent him in the sight of God—its blood his life, its organs his capacities. We may not trust to our mere bodily presence while God is being approached and besought, or while Christ’s redeeming work is being pleaded, or while words of dedication are being uttered in prayer. There must be the positive, sympathetic, personal participation, or we stand outside the service and the blessing. 2. *That we must intelligently discriminate between the obligatory and the optional in the service of God.* Certain things were imperative in the act of worship, other things were left to the choice of the individual. In the gospel of Christ and the worship of God there are things essential that none may depart from, e.g. the humble heart, the act of faith and self-surrender, the spirit of obedience toward God and of love toward man; there are other things which are left to personal discretion, e.g. times and methods of devotion, scale of contribution, sphere of usefulness. Yet in these optional matters we are not to act inconsiderately or irrationally, but according to the direction of wisdom and the teachings of experience.—C.

Ver. 17.—*The guarding of sacred feeling.* No little stress is laid on the prohibition

of two things—the fat and the blood of slain animals: it was to be “a perpetual statute for your generations throughout all your dwellings.” The fat thus interdicted was that which was offered in sacrifice (vers. 3, 4, 9, 10), not that which was interlined with the lean (Neh. viii. 10). We may look at—

I. **THE MEANING OF THIS PROHIBITION IN THEIR CASE.** Evidently both the fat and the blood were disallowed as food because they were offered in sacrifice to Jehovah. On this account they were to be preserved sacred. They were not to be treated as ordinary things, vulgarized, lowered in public estimation; a feeling of their sacredness was to be cherished and carefully preserved by daily habit. To be continually using these parts as meat and drink at table would have the effect which was to be deprecated. It was, therefore, an act of religious duty to abstain from them. By such abstinence their feelings of reverence and piety would be guarded and preserved. Was it not for a similar reason, viz. that no violation should be done to the sacred sentiment of maternity, that the law was thrice repeated, “Thou shalt not seethe a kid in his mother’s milk” (Exod. xxiii. 19, etc.)? The influence of daily habit on the finer sentiments of the soul is very gradual and imperceptible, but in the end it is very great: it is often decisive for good or evil.

II. **ITS BEARING ON OUR OWN RELIGIOUS LIFE.** We are to guard most sedulously our sacred feelings; to “keep our heart above all keeping” (Prov. iv. 23). Among other perils to be avoided is that of allowing sacred things to be vulgarized by too frequent use, to lose their force and virtue by reason of over-familiarity. With this end in view, there will be, on the part of the prudent, a certain measure of: 1. *Wise limitation.* This will apply to (1) the use of the Divine name (the avoidance of profanity); (2) the employment of pious phraseology in ordinary speech (the avoidance of offensive and injurious cant); (3) the repetition of sacred formulas (the avoidance of a Pharisaic formalism); (4) the multiplication of holy days (Rom. xiv. 6). (5) These matters, and such as these, are questions of expediency, to be determined by practical Christian wisdom. Both extremes are to be avoided—the neglect of good things and so the loss of spiritual help, and their excessive use resulting in the loss of the sense of sacredness. The latter is a subtle and strong evil, for when sacred things have lost their sanctity to us, there is little left to elevate and restore. “If the salt have lost its savour,” etc. But beside wise limitation, there must be: 2. *Positive spiritual endeavour.* It will by no means suffice to conform to good rules of speech and behaviour: such abstinences will not preserve a reverent and loving spirit; we must *think seriously* and *pray earnestly*. (1) By serious thought we must be frequently realizing how great is our indebtedness to the heavenly Father; how real is our need, as sinners, of the Divine Saviour; how urgent is our want, as weak and struggling souls, of the influence of the Holy Spirit! (2) By earnest prayer we must be drawing down from on high that spiritual replenishment which God is willing to bestow on all seeking souls, and without which all life will languish, all means and methods prove fruitless and vain.—C.

Vers. 1—17.—*The peace offerings*, also called *thank offerings* or *salvation offerings*. The twofold object—to acknowledge salvation received, to supplicate salvation desired. Three kinds—praise offerings, vow offerings, free-will offerings. Considerable freedom permitted in them, though still restrictions observed. Male and female victims, of the herd and flock, but only those without blemish. No pigeons permitted, because a pair of pigeons insufficient for the sacrificial meal, which was so important a constituent of the service. Combination of the burnt sacrifice with the peace offering in the consumption by fire of the suet or fat of the internal organs, and of the fat tail of the sheep. The fat and the blood offered to the Lord in a special manner, by fire and sprinkling “on the altar round about.”

Ver. 1.—*The offering distinguished.* *Oblation* denotes its voluntary character; sacrifice its intimate connection with the altar, that is, its participation in the atoning significance of all the bloody sacrifices which carried in them the idea of reconciliation with God through the blood of the covenant. *Peace offering*, the specific distinction, recognizing the fact that, whether the prominent feeling expressed was praise or prayer, still the offerer was standing on the ground of covenant fellowship with God. We may take these offerings generally to symbolize *salvation as a realized fact*. We find under this general fact these *three constituent spiritual realities included*: I.

*Intercourse re-established between God and man*, and expressed in grateful praise and willing dependence. II. *Salvation as a fact resting on continued faith*; the three parts of the sacrifice being the offerer's part, the priest's part, and Jehovah's part,—all essential and harmonized in one offering. III. *Joy of salvation*, both individual and social, typified in the sacrificial meal, God, as it were, giving back the victim to be the source of delight both to the priest and the offerer. On each of these points the details of the sacrifice have their significance.

I. RECONCILIATION. Re-established intercourse between God and man, grateful praise, willing dependence. Here we may notice the two sides of the sacrifice: that turned *towards man*—it is *willingly* brought, it is a *valuable* gift, it is brought as a *peace offering* to give praise or to accompany vows and prayers; that turned *towards God*, it is a confession of sin, an obedience rendered to the Law, a renewal of the covenant, a confirmation of the promises, a seal of grace. *Intercourse between man and God.* 1. Distinguish between the truth as set forth in Scripture, and man's self-derived ideas. (1) Consider the non-scriptural views: the notions of the mystic or of the transcendentalist—man's lifting himself to God, or being lifted up by ecstasy; the rationalistic conception that God and man meet in nature, or in human consciousness, and that such intercourse in the mere laws of fact or thought is sufficient. All such reconciliation ignores the fallen state of man, can supply no gospel of peace, is contradicted by the plain development of righteousness in the course of the world; and therefore the necessity made evident that man, as going on to meet the future, should be prepared to meet his God in judgment, in the great adjustment of right and wrong. The mere moralist falls into a similar error when he teaches that the partial obedience of human life to Divine Law, the recognition practically of an ideal moral standard, is a reconciliation between the highest moral Being and his creature. (2) Place opposite to these defective and erroneous views the teaching of Scripture. Out of the original source of all, *the will of God*, that is, his infinite nature or character, in actual relation to his universe, comes forth the reconciliation. Revelation from the beginning an invitation of God to man to intercourse. The Mosaic Law was the development of the preceding covenant, which, under patriarchal ministry, was a gospel of peace. The reconciliation was placed on the foundation of sacrifice, that is, man's surrender, blending with God's promise of forgiveness and life, the preservation of righteousness in the acceptance of man's homage to the Divine character, the assurance of peace in a covenant of friendship and interchange of love. 2. This intercourse between God and man being thus established, it is expressed in *grateful praise and willing dependence* on man's part, in the bestowment of *peace and sanctification* on God's part. The *peace offering* typified the life of man as a continual reciprocation of covenant intercourse: the presentation of gifts to God, the acceptance in return of Divine grace. Thus was religion set forth. It is not separated from the earthly life, but it is its consecration. It is not a meritorious purchase of Divine favour, or turning away of wrath, or covering of the reality of transgression with sacrifice, but a thankful dedication of saved life, a subjection of all to the will of the Father, an appropriation of heavenly gifts. Perhaps the fact that no poor man's offering is prescribed may indicate that the truth was already implied, though not so distinctly expressed as afterwards in the Psalms and Prophets, that God would have mercy and not sacrifice, that he laid no stress upon the actual presentation of a peace offering so long as the man himself and his life were offered in devout obedience and thankful spirit. “Whoso offereth praise glorifieth me: and to him that ordereth his conversation aright will I show the salvation of God” (Ps. i. 23).

II. SALVATION AS A FACT RESTS ON CONTINUED FAITH. In every peace offering there were three parts—the offerer's, the priest's, Jehovah's. On each occasion, therefore, the main elements of salvation were recognized, which were these: 1. *Free grace*. 2. *Mediation*. 3. *Self-surrender*. In each the offerer's faith makes salvation a fact. 1. In bringing a peace offering to Jehovah, the worshipper cast himself by faith on the free grace which opened the way for him to reconciliation and peace. “We love him because he first loved us.” The Jew failed to see this freedom of Divine love, and hence became a bond slave under the power of his ritual. The gospel has exalted the Divine element so high above the human in the advent of the Son of God, that it is no longer possible to hide it. “God was in Christ reconciling the world unto him—

self" "The Lord hath visited his people." We build all on the foundation stone which God himself hath laid. We begin with the person of Christ, divinely glorious. Our faith lays hold of eternal life in him who was the Life and the Light of men. 2. The offerer brought the victim, but the priestly *mediation* was a necessary part of the ceremony. Salvation as a fact rests not only upon the free and infinite love of God, but upon the manifested righteousness and ceaseless intercession of the Saviour. "Aaron's sons sprinkle the blood; Aaron's sons burn the fat on the altar on the burnt sacrifice; a sweet savour unto the Lord." Our life as a saved life is a continual application to ourselves by faith of the merit and efficacy of the Saviour's atonement and ministry as our great High Priest. The "truth as it is in Jesus" is the food of our thoughts, the joy of our hearts, the strength of our obedience. Salvation as a fact is realized forgiveness, progressive holiness in communion with Christ, victory through his grace over the world and all enemies, and at last participation in the glorification of the Divine Man, and admission into his eternal kingdom. 3. *Self-surrender* was both in the presentation of the offering and in the position of the offerer, laying his hand on the head of the victim, killing it, and giving up the assigned portions to the altar and fire; all was confession, consecration, obedience. Our faith is essentially a yielding of ourselves to God. We find our salvation a fact, just as we "put off the old man and put on the new man;" just as we "count all things loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus our Lord." Our offering is a peace offering, both of the past and for the future. We are no longer our own. Christ is all to us, and so we are Christ's, and Christ is God's.

III. JOY OF SALVATION, typified in the sacrificial meal, in which the representatives of God and man, in the priests and offerer, met together in social festivity. This was anticipation of the sacred meal, the Supper of the Lord, in which sacrificial joy was celebrated in the new society, in the kingdom of God. The Christian's joy is pre-eminently joy of salvation. He builds all happiness on the fact of reconciliation with God. He lives his new life not unto himself, but unto Christ and to Christ's people. The social gladness, which was an element in the peace offering, points to the fact that the redemption of Christ effects a deliverance of society from its bondage and misery, as well as the individual soul from its sin and ruin. Such a message is specially wanted in these times, when the world groans under its burdens, and strives in vain after a true liberty and peace. What offerings are laid on the altar of war! Yet they are consumed in vain. There is no happy banquet of fellowship and brotherhood coming out of such sacrifices. God invites us to the joy of a new-made world. He bids us proclaim the way of peace to be through the obedience of Christ. How sweet the savour to the Lord when the whole human family shall offer up its peace offering, acceptable, because identified with the offering of Calvary, uniting all together in a sacred festivity of gladness!—R.

Vers. 3, 4.—"The fat that covereth the inwards;" "the caul above the liver, with the kidneys;" "all the fat is the Lord's" (ver. 16). The sweet fat, or suet, was burned as a sweet savour to the Lord. This might be either because fat of this kind was a sign of perfection in the animal life, or because the offering in the fire would be increased by the oily matter, and would make the burnt offering more imposing. Any way the dedication to the Lord is the main idea.

I. RELIGIOUS SERVICE SHOULD TAKE UP INTO ITSELF THE HIGHEST FACULTIES AND NOBLEST AFFECTIONS. The worship of the sanctuary; the active efforts of Christians in the spread of the gospel; charity;—in all such sacrifices let "the fat be the Lord's."

II. THE PROSPERITY OF HUMAN LIFE IS ONLY SAFE AND BLESSED WHEN THE SUBSTANCE OF IT IS CONSECRATED ON THE ALTAR. Men become victims of their own success because they withhold the fat from the Lord, and it becomes a curse to them.—R.

Ver. 5.—"And Aaron's sons shall burn it on the altar *upon* the burnt sacrifice, which is upon the wood that is on the fire: it is an offering made by fire, of a sweet savour unto the Lord." Notice the preparation thus made for the acceptance of man's offering. There is the *altar*, the *fire*, the *wood*, the *burnt sacrifice*, the offering of the *consecrated fat*. Thus ch. vi. 12, it is said, "the priest shall burn wood every morning

at the altar, and lay the burnt offering in order upon it; and he shall burn thereon the fat of the peace offerings." The abiding sacrifice, on the abiding altar, with the abiding fire, receives the occasional offering of the individual worshipper. Here is the great truth of an abiding merit, an ever-living intercession set forth.

I. God, by his grace, has provided for us **THE TRUE METHOD OF RIGHTEOUSNESS AND ACCEPTANCE.** 1. The superiority of Christ's sacrifice to all other—because of his person, his active and passive obedience, his declared acceptance by his baptism, transfiguration, resurrection, ascension. 2. The simple work of faith, in laying the offering on the ashes of the burnt sacrifice, in attaching the imperfect obedience of man to the infinite merit of Christ. A peace offering in the highest sense when we thus lay all upon the altar of the true mediation. The fire consuming denoted acceptance. God, in Christ, declares himself not only well pleased in his beloved Son, but in all who spiritually are identified with him. The lesser burnt offering is absorbed into the greater and abiding burnt offering, our obedience in Christ's.

II. Thus is set forth **THE TRUE ORDER OF THE ETHICAL LIFE.** The lesser sacrifice upon the greater. The peace offering on the burnt offering. 1. Common mistake to attempt to reverse this order. Man supposes himself capable of building up merit by moral acts. God teaches him that all ethical worth must rest upon religious completeness. The relation between God and man must be true and perfect, otherwise morality is not real, but only disguised selfishness. 2. The offering up of human life in activity, in suffering, cannot be *peace* offering unless it be religious. We want the greatest motive to actuate and sustain. We seem to waste our offering unless we can see it in its relation with God's work, with a redeemed and renewed world. 3. The sweetness of life is a return into our own hearts of what the Lord hath found delightful. The "*sweet savour*" of a consecrated obedience pervades the whole existence, and makes it fragrant both to ourselves and others. Wonderful transmuting power of religion in giving value to the apparently worthless in human character, and beauty to the commonest, and nobleness to the humblest; the whole garment of sanctity covering the native imperfections. Yet no sweet savour without fire. There must be the reality of a spiritual life—the power of God, not the mere form and appearance of the offering.—R.

Vers. 6—16.—*Varieties in the offerings—unity in the sacrifice.* Whether from the herd or from the flock, an offering of larger or smaller value, the same principle applies—the unblemished gift, the separation of the fat and of the blood, the observance of all prescribed order and detail.

I. Here is the **TRUE RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.** Obedience according to ability, "doing the will of God from the heart." The variety which is necessitated in God's children by their different capabilities and circumstances is not displeasing to him. If we cannot bring an offering from the herd, then from the flock; if not a sheep, then a lamb; if neither, then the will for the deed. Yet all can do something. "Unto every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ" (Eph. iv. and 1 Cor. xii.).

II. Here is the secret of **SOCIAL PEACE AND STRENGTH**—the only true equality; God's altar bringing together rich and poor, high and low. All, offering what they can to him, find out each other's nearness and worth. In the house of God the poor man may be a higher servant of the sanctuary than the rich. Society rests on religion as its basis. Mistake of philosophy, which gives us not brotherhood but altruism—not family life but mere expediency. The true conception of a State is every one having a place, and every one in his place. None but the religious view, which makes the altar of God the centre, really effects this union of the individual interest with that of the community. The true mother does not despise the sickly child. Philosophy exalts the great and depresses the little. Religion humbles the great and exalts the low. The revelation is to babes. The offering is accepted from the weakest hands. All are one in Christ. The perfect Sacrifice blends all together.—R.

## EXPOSITION.

## CHAPTER IV.

THE SIN OFFERING (chs. iv., v. 1-13). At the time of the Mosaic legislation, burnt offerings and meat offerings were already in existence, and had existed from the time of the Fall. A beginning, therefore, is made with them, and the regulations of the peace offerings naturally follow, because these sacrifices succeed in order to the burnt and meat offerings, and because sacrifices in some respects of the same nature as peace offerings had previously existed under a different name (cf. Exod. x. 25 with Exod. xxiv. 5, and see above notes on ch. iii.). The sin and trespass offerings, therefore, are left to the last, though, owing to their meaning, they were always offered first of all, when sacrifices of all three kinds were made together. They are the means of ceremonially propitiating God when alienated from his people, or from any individual member of it, by sin, which they legally atone for. The need of expiation is implied and suggested by the offering of the blood, both in the burnt sacrifice and the peace offering (cf. Job i. 5). But this was not sufficient; there must be a special sacrifice to teach this great truth as its primary lesson. The sin offering typifies the sacrifice of our Lord JESUS CHRIST upon the cross, as the great Sin Offering for mankind, whereby the wrath of God was propitiated, and an expiation for the sins of man was wrought, bringing about reconciliation between God and man.

Ver. 2.—If a soul shall sin. The conditions to be fulfilled in presenting a sin offering differed according to the position held by the offerer in the state. If it were the high priest, he had (1) to offer a young bull in the court of the tabernacle; (2) to place his hand upon it; (3) to kill it; (4) to take the blood into the holy place of the tabernacle, and there sprinkle some of it seven times in the direction of the vail that divided off the holy of holies within which the ark was placed, and to smear some of it on the horns of the golden altar of incense; (5) to pour out the rest of the blood at the foot of the altar of burnt offering in the court of the tabernacle; (6) to burn all the internal fat upon the altar of burnt offering; (7) to carry the whole of the remainder of the

animal outside the camp, and there to burn it. If it were the congregation that made the offering, the same conditions had to be fulfilled, except that the elders of the congregation had to lay their hands on the animal. If it were a ruler, the animal offered was to be a male kid, and the priest, instead of taking the blood into the sanctuary, was to smear it on the horns of the altar of burnt sacrifice in the court. If it were an ordinary member of the congregation, the animal was to be a female kid, or ewe lamb, which was to be dealt with in the same manner; or in some cases two turtle-doves or two young pigeons, one for a sin offering (whose blood was all sprinkled round the inner side of the altar), the other for a burnt offering (which was to be treated according to the ritual of the burnt offering), or even the tenth part of an ephah of flour (without oil or frankincense), a handful of which was to be burnt, and the remainder delivered to the priest for his consumption. The moral lesson taught to the Jew by the sin offering was of the terrible nature of sin, and of the necessity for an expiation for it in addition to penitence. Mystically he might see that, as the blood of bulls and goats could not of its own virtue take away sin, there must be an offering, foreshadowed by the sacrifice of the animals, which should be effectual as these were symbolical. The type is fulfilled by the atonement wrought by Christ's blood shed on the cross (see Heb. x. 1-21). Further, the ceremonial cleansing of the sinful Israelite by the sin offering in the old dispensation foreshadows the effect of baptism in the new dispensation, for, as Calvin has noted in his Commentary, "As sins are now sacramentally washed away by baptism, so under the Law also sacrifices were expiations, although in a different way."

If a soul shall sin through ignorance. The expression, "through ignorance" (*bishagagah*), is intended to cover all sins except those committed "with a high hand," or defiantly, whether the agent was ignorant that they were sins or was led into them by inconsiderateness or infirmity (cf. Ps. xix. 12, 13, "Who can understand his errors? Cleanse thou me from secret faults. Keep back thy servant also from presumptuous sins"). A better translation of *bishagagah* would be *by want of consideration*, or *by inadvertence*. Our Lord could say, even of those who crucified him, "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do;" and therefore even for them a sin offering might be made and be accepted. But for deliberate and determined sin the Law has no atone-

ment, no remedy. The works, shall do against any of them, i.e. against the commandments, would be better rendered shall do any of them, i.e. the things which ought not to be done. There is no exact apodosis to this verse; it is a general heading to the chapter.

Vers. 8—12.—The case of the high priest. He is designated the priest that is anointed, in respect to which title, see notes on ch. viii. In case he sins in his representative character, his sin is such as to bring guilt on the people (this is the meaning of the words translated according to the sin of the people), and a special sin offering must therefore be made. He is to take of the blood of the animal sacrificed, and bring it to the tabernacle of the congregation: . . . and sprinkle of the blood seven times before the Lord, before the veil of the sanctuary. And put some of the blood on the horns of the altar of sweet incense. This was a more solemn method of presenting the blood to the Lord than that used in the burnt offering; the offering of the blood, which was the vehicle of life, being the chief feature in the sin offering, as the consumption of the whole animal by the altar fire was in the burnt offering. In the burnt offerings and peace offerings the blood was thrown once on the altar of burnt sacrifice (see ch. i. 5); now it is sprinkled, in a smaller quantity each time, but as often as seven times (the number seven symbolically representing completeness), before the veil which shrouded the ark. The altar of sweet incense is the golden altar, which stood within the tabernacle, in front of the veil. Perhaps the reason why the horns of the altar are specially appointed to have the blood placed on them is that they were regarded as the most sacred part of the altar, because they were its highest points, in which its elevation towards heaven culminated. The remainder of the victim's blood is to be poured at the bottom of the altar of the burnt offering, in the court of the tabernacle, to sink into the ground, because no more of it was wanted for ceremonial use. The internal fat is to be burnt upon the altar of the burnt offering, but not actually upon the amouldering burnt sacrifice, as in the case of the peace offerings; the sin offering preceding the burnt offering in order of time, while the peace offering followed it. The remainder of the animal is to be carried without the camp . . . and be burnt, because its flesh was at once accursed and most holy. It was accursed, as having been symbolically the vehicle of the sins laid upon it by the offerer; therefore it must not be consumed

upon the altar of God, but be destroyed with fire outside the camp, typifying the removal from God's kingdom, and the final destruction of all that is sinful. But yet it was most holy, as its blood had been taken into the tabernacle, and had served as a propitiation; therefore, if it had to be burnt, it yet had to be burnt solemnly, reverently, and as a ceremonial act, in a place appointed for the purpose. The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews notices that one of the points in which our Lord was the antitype of the sin offering was that he "suffered without the gate," "that he might sanctify the people with his own blood" (Heb. xii. 12), which was thus indicated to have been carried within the sanctuary, that is, into heaven.

Vers. 13—21.—The case of the whole congregation. A nation may become guilty of national sin in different ways, according to its political constitution: most directly, by the action of a popular Legislature passing a decree such as that of the Athenian assembly, condemning the whole of the Mityleneen people to death (Thucyd., iii. 36), or by approving an act of sacrilege (Mal. iii. 9); indirectly, by any complicity in or condoning of a sin done in its name by its rulers. The ritual of the sin offering is the same as in the case of the high priest. The elders of the congregation (according to the Targum of Jonathan, twelve in number), acting for the nation, lay their hands on the victim's head, and the high priest, as before, presents the blood, by sprinkling it seven times before the Lord, even before the veil; and putting some of the blood upon the horns of the altar which is before the Lord, that is in the tabernacle of the congregation. It is added that he shall thus make an atonement, or covering of sin, for them, and it shall be forgiven them.

Vers. 22—26.—The case of a ruler or nobleman. The clause, Or if his sin . . . come to his knowledge, should be rather translated, If perhaps his sin come to his knowledge. He is to offer a kid of the goats, or rather a he-goat. The blood is not to be carried into the tabernacle, as in the two previous cases, but put upon the horns of the altar of burnt offering, which stood outside in the court, and, as a consequence of the blood not having been taken into the tabernacle, the flesh is not to be burnt outside the camp, but to be eaten by the priests in the court of the tabernacle (see ch. vi. 26).

Vers. 27—35.—The case of a common man. He is to offer a kid of the goats, or rather a she-goat. The ritual is to be the same as in the previous case.

## HOMILETICS.

Vers. 1—35.—*The sin offering* signifies and ceremonially effects propitiation and expiation. Its characteristic feature, therefore, is the presentation of the blood of the victim, which in this sacrifice alone (when it was offered for the high priest or the whole congregation) was carried into the tabernacle and solemnly sprinkled before the veil which covered God's presence.

I. WHEN IT WAS TO BE OFFERED. On certain solemn public occasions, and whenever the conscience of an individual was awakened to being out of communion with God. The contraction of certain defilements and the commission of certain sins excluded the delinquent from God's people, and when this had occurred, he might not be readmitted until he had brought a sin offering to be offered in his behalf.

II. HOW IT WAS EFFECTIVE. The fact of God's appointing it for a certain end made it effective for that end; but we are allowed to see why God appointed it, and this was because it was a shadow of the Great Atonement to be wrought for all mankind by the Christian Sin Offering of the cross. For the result of original sin and the consequent growth and spread of wickedness upon the earth had separated between God and man. How were they to be reconciled? Christ became the representative of sinful man, and the substitute for him, and in this capacity he bore the penalty of sins, (1) in the Garden of Gethsemane, (2) on the cross—thus restoring man to communion with God.

## III. THINGS TO BE NOTED—

1. The wrath of God against sin.
2. The love of God towards sinners.
3. The justice of God.
4. The love of Christ in his incarnation.
5. The obedience of Christ in his death.
6. The blessed result to man, namely, union and communion with God, through Christ the Peace-maker.

IV. THE OFFERING MADE ONCE FOR ALL. The Jewish offerings could be brought again and again; the Christian Sin Offering could be made but once. There can be no repetition of it, no continuation of it; but its effects are always continuing, and applicable to all Christ's people. Its benefits are to be grasped and appropriated, each time that they are needed, by faith. As the Israelite laid his hand on the sin offering, so we lean by faith on Christ, and may constantly plead the merits of the offering which cannot be renewed. In case we have fallen into sin, we may not, like the Israelite, bring our bullock for sacrifice; we cannot renew the Great Sacrifice typified by the bullock's sacrifice; but, by repentance and by faith in the atonement wrought by the sacrifice of Christ's death, we can be restored.

## V. FEELINGS AWAKENED—

Thankfulness for God's mercy in finding a way of escape;

Thankfulness for Christ's love in working out man's salvation;

A blessed sense of peace resulting from the consciousness that the Great Atoning Sacrifice has been offered.

## HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

*Atonement for the penitent, as illustrated in the sin offering.* Ch. iv.; v. 1—13; cf. Ps. xix. 12; Gal. vi. 1; 1 Tim. i. 13, etc. The offerings already considered, viz. the burnt offering, the meat offering, and the peace offering, have respectively emphasized the ideas of *personal consecration*, *consecrated life-work*, and *fellowship*. Moreover, they are to be regarded as voluntary offerings, depending upon the impulse of the heart for their celebration. Special experience might impel an Israelite to express his consecration or his fellowship, and he would then bring the appointed sacrifice.

But here we come across an offering which is *imperative*. The moment an Israelite became convinced of sin, then he was bound to bring the offering prescribed. Besides, the sin offering is Mosaic in its origin; it had no existence, as such, before the promul-

gation of the covenant at Sinai; and consequently it is to be taken as the rule for *penitents*, whose consciences have been educated in a more thorough detection of sin through the Law. "By the law is the knowledge of sin." We have at this stage, consequently, a perceptible elevation of the moral standard.

I. THE FIRST LESSON OF THE SIN OFFERING IS THAT SIN IS A NATURE. The superficial treatment of sin deals with outward and conscious acts, such as trespasses; what God declares by his Law is that, behind all conscious acts of the will, there are *natural* movements of which we are not conscious, and for which, nevertheless, we are responsible. This important principle is affirmed by all these minute regulations about sins of ignorance. The thoughtful Israelite would see from this that sin is a much wider and deeper thing than he at first suspected; that the motions of his personal being are more numerous and varied than he supposed; that deliberation, in fact, is not essential to every sin, and does not cover responsibility. In other words, he would look within and realize that sin is a nature, working on, sometimes consciously and sometimes unconsciously, and that for all its workings he will be held accountable.

No more important principle lies in the field of self-examination. Without it there can be no thorough treatment of sin. With it we stand abashed and humbled under a sense of the unknown sin as well as of the known. We cry with David, "Who can understand his errors? cleanse thou me from secret faults. Keep back thy servant also from presumptuous sins; let them not have dominion over me: then shall I be upright, and I shall be innocent from the great transgression" (Pa. xix. 12, 13; cf. also Shedd's 'Discourses and Essays,' No. VI.).

II. SIN VARIES IN ITS HEINOUSNESS. The Israelite not only recognized this whole category of sins of ignorance marshalled in the Law before him; he also saw a difference of treatment in the cases under review. A sin of ignorance on the part of the high priest was made more emphatic than one on the part of a prince or a private person. The high priest's representative position and character modified the whole case. His sin of omission or neglect became much more serious than a private individual's could be. He was consequently directed to bring a bullock, the same offering as for a sin on the part of the collective people; for his representative character made him, so to speak, a *moral equivalent* to them. While, therefore, it is well to recognize sin as a nature, we must also remember that God does not treat sin in the mass, but discriminates between the more or less guilty. In his morality there are the most delicate appreciations and adjustments. Penitence must likewise be discriminating as well as profound. Self-examination may be a most humiliating and disappointing process, but we should weigh the relations of our faults and sins when we discover them and deal faithfully with ourselves.

III. YET ALL SINNERS ARE PLACED WITHIN REACH OF AN APPROPRIATE ATONEMENT. The high priest and the collective people, the prince and one of the common people, each and all had their prescribed offering and guaranteed atonement. And when people proved so poor that they could not offer turtle-doves or young pigeons, they were directed to bring an ephah of fine flour, with which the priest would make atonement. And as for this atonement, it is in all cases secured by the *surrender of life*. Even the ephah of flour conveyed this idea, for the germ is hopelessly sacrificed in its manufacture. The one idea binding the various sacrifices together is the surrender of life. That this idea is to be attributed to substances in the vegetable kingdom as well as the animal, is evident from John xii. 24, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone: but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit."

And it need scarcely be added that the atonement of which these sin offerings were types is that of the Lord Jesus, who "was once offered to bear the sins of many" (Heb. ix. 28; also vers. 11—14). In the proclamation of the gospel, this most appropriate atonement is put within the reach of all. No sinner is excluded from the possibility of atonement except through his own self-will.

IV. THE RECONCILIATION WITH THE PENITENT, WHICH ATONEMENT SECURES, IS A MATTER OF DEEP DELIGHT TO GOD. For not only is the blood of the sacrifice accepted at the appropriate spot, whether veil and altar of incense, or the brazen altar only, according to the *status* of the penitent; but there is besides an acceptance of the best portions of the animal upon the altar, indicating that God is delighted with the

accomplished atonement. It was, so far as God was concerned, as much a feast as the peace offering. It expressed, consequently, that God was delighted beyond all our conception with the reconciliation.

It is well to make this idea always emphatic. Our blinded souls are ready to imagine that we are more anxious for reconciliation, and would be more delighted with it when it came, than God can be. The truth, however, is all the other way. The reconciliation begins with God, the atonement is due to his wisdom and mercy, and over the actual consummation he rejoices with "joy unspeakable and full of glory."

V. THE RECONCILIATION IS ALSO MEANT TO BE A FEAST OF DELIGHT TO ALL GOD'S SERVANTS WHO ARE INSTRUMENTAL IN BRINGING IT ABOUT. For we must notice that, in the cases where the priests are not penitents themselves, but mediators, they are allowed to make a feast of what is left after the best portions are dedicated to God. Of course, when they are penitents, as in the case of a personal or a congregational sin, the carcase is to be considered *too holy* for the priests to partake of it; hence it is disposed of in its entirety in a *clean* place beyond the camp. This was the solemn way of disposing of the whole carcase. But in the other cases the priests were directed to feast upon the remainder of the offering, as those bearing atonement. So far they enjoyed what was their lot in the peace offering. As a feast, and not a lugubrious fast, it surely was intended to indicate their personal joy and satisfaction in the reconciliation they were instrumental in bringing about.

Luke xv. presents the joy of the Godhead and of the angels over returning penitents. It is this spirit we should cultivate. It will require, of course, much personal dealing with souls, but it is worth all the trouble to be instrumental in leading them to peace with God, and to the joy that results therefrom.—R. M. E.

Vers. 1, 9.—*Unintentional transgression.* God is the source of authority and law. From him instructions emanate. His words are to be communicated to the people. Like unto Moses, ministers and teachers receive truth not to secrete it in their own breasts, but to impart it for the guidance of those under their charge. "The Lord spake, . . . saying, Speak unto the children of Israel." May we listen carefully, lest the utterances of the "still small voice" should be misheard, and the counsels intended for comfort and direction prove a false light, speeding the unconscious traveller to the very pitfalls he was to avoid.

I. THE UNIVERSALITY OF TRANSGRESSION. Provision is announced for cases of sin, and the possibility of its commission by all classes is thus shown. 1. *The ordinary citizen* may err; one of "the people of the land" (see ver. 27). Poverty and obscurity are not safeguards against unrighteous acts. 2. *The man of rank*, the "ruler" (ver. 22) or prince, is liable to sin. Honour and responsibility do not guarantee or produce immunity from transgression. 3. *The whole congregation* (ver. 13) is not exempt, for collective wisdom and might are not effectual barriers against the encroachments of unlawful desire and action. In the multitude of counsellors safety is often thought to lie, but the "people" may be wickedly as well as an individual. This was exemplified at Mount Sinai and Baal-peor, and modern instances abound. Even—4. *The man specially consecrated to holy service*, the "anointed priest" (ver. 8), may incur guilt and bring punishment upon the people. How cautious we should be! What searching of ourselves with the candle of the Lord; what prayer for knowledge and strength should distinguish us all!

II. THE POSSIBILITY OF UNINTENTIONAL TRANSGRESSION. A distinction is intimated between sin that arises from mistake ("ignorance," ver. 2), that is at first "hid" from perception and afterwards becomes known (vers. 13, 14), awaking penitence and a desire to undo the wrong perpetrated, and sin that is wilful, committed with a high hand, with an attitude of defiance, a sin against light and knowledge. Inadvertent sinning is possible through (1) carelessness of behaviour, heedless conduct, acting without previous deliberation; or (2) a misunderstanding of the Law, failure in correct interpretation, or in remembering the precise precept at the moment; or (3) a sudden outburst of passion, blinding the judgment and hurrying the will to words and deeds afterwards repented of.

III. THE GUILT OF SUCH TRANSGRESSION. This is assumed by the atonement necessary to shield the doer from penalty, and by the expressions employed in vers. 13, 22, and 27. "Guilty" refers to the consequences of sinning, the state of wrath into which

the sinner enters, and the moral devastation to which he is liable, and from which preservation is possible only through an offering. Learn, then, that ignorance does not of itself excuse violation of God's commands, but it permits resort to such an atonement as will procure God's forgiveness. Paul said, "I obtained mercy because I did it ignorantly and in unbelief." Whereas if we sin wilfully, there is no more sacrifice for sins. The soul that doeth presumptuously shall be cut off from among the people.—S. R. A.

Ver. 3.—"Let him bring for his sin, which he hath sinned." *The atonement for involuntary transgression.* The Book of Leviticus well repays careful perusal in days when there are many attempts made to lessen men's sense of the enormity of sin and of the necessity of a propitiatory offering. Its teachings are impressive, its pictures vivid.

I. SIN INFILTS AN INJURY UPON THE HOLINESS OF GOD, AND EXPOSES MAN TO PENAL CONSEQUENCES. The words used to denote sin imply a turning aside from the path marked out, a deviation from rectitude. Man misses his way, goes astray like a lost sheep. He does what he ought not to do (ver. 2), and thereby the precepts of God are slighted and God's honour is wounded. This cannot be permitted with impunity. The wrath of God, not a base but holy passion, is aroused, and vengeance or holy indignation threatens to visit the transgressor. We think wrongly of our sinful acts if we minimize their awful importance, or pay regard simply to the injury done to ourselves. This is the least part. The Supreme Being is concerned, and it is his displeasure we have to fear. Sin cuts at the root of government, assails the foundations of the eternal throne.

II. EVERY TRANSGRESSION IS RECOGNIZED AS SINFUL, whether arising from ignorance or wilfulness, whether an act of omission or commission. An atonement is insisted on even for what we deem the least flagrant derelictions. Man is so ready to extenuate his crimes, that God strips off the veil, and exposes sin in all its guiltiness, a thing to be loathed and shunned wherever met, requiring purification on our part, however accidentally we may have come in contact with it. That without intention we trod upon a venomous serpent, does not protect us from its fangs. We shall need the remedy, however the poison may have injected.

III. PENITENCE AND CONFESSION ARE INSUFFICIENT TO OBLITERATE THE MEMORY OF THE SIN. To regret the act and to express sorrow and to determine not to offend again, are good as far as they go, but, to wipe out the stain, blood must be shed. This only can whiten the defiled robes. Sinner, behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world! To have the sin brought to your knowledge, so that you take a more adequate view of its sinfulness, to pour forth agonizing cries and floods of tears, will not obtain forgiveness, unless accompanied with the presentation to the Father of the righteousness of his Son.

IV. SIN BECOMES MORE CONSPICUOUS AND FAR-REACHING WHEN COMMITTED BY THE OCCUPANTS OF A LOFTY POSITION. The high priest was the representative of the nation, and hence his offering must equal in value that presented by the whole congregation. So likewise the sin of a ruler was more visible than that of a subject, and wronged God the more, and whilst a she-goat sufficed for one of the people, for him only a he-goat was allowed. Not without reason did the apostle exhort that intercession be made "for kings, and all that are in authority." Iniquity in high places in the Church and in society causes the greatest scandal, becomes most hurtful in its effects, and is most offensive to God. Both the animal offered and the ritual observed testified to the relative enormity of transgressions by different classes. Between the sins of each order in themselves no distinction was made.

V. BY THE APPOINTED VICTIM RECONCILIATION IS POSSIBLE TO ALL INADVERTENT OFFENDERS. We reserve this to the last, in order that the cheeriest aspect may be uppermost. Divest honour of its consequent responsibility we cannot, but we point to the ample provision for forgiveness afforded to comfort the prince and the peasant, the priest and the layman, the individual and the nation. Our Redeemer, Jesus Christ, has given his life a ransom for the many. He satisfies all claims, reconciles us unto God, so that our trespasses are not imputed unto us.—S. R. A.

Vers. 3-12.—*Rites essential to an atonement.* Who could stand in the tabernacle court without having imprinted on his mind the view God takes of the guilt of sin, and

the necessity for the sinner's deliverance from its results? The victims brought for sacrifice, the priests devoted to the sacrificial work, the altars of burnt offering and incense, the veil that separated the holy from the holiest place—all these were eminently calculated to deepen the Israelites' conviction of the holiness of the Almighty, and the awfulness of violating his injunctions. Neglecting the distinctions enumerated in this chapter according to the rank occupied by the transgressor, let us take a general survey of the conditions enforced in a proper offering for sin.

I. **THE DEATH OF AN APPOINTED VICTIM.** The hand of the offerer is placed on the animal's head, and the animal's life is surrendered to the will of God. "Without shedding of blood is no remission." This tragic spectacle attests forcibly the rigour of God's requirements. Christ died as our representative, so that in him we all died (2 Cor. v.), and those who rejoice in the thought of his salvation place their hands by faith upon him, believing that he was "made a curse" for them. Holiness demands an unblemished victim in each case. Hence the impossibility of man becoming his own atonement. Sin cannot expiate sin.

II. **THE SPRINKLING OF THE BLOOD BY THE HIGH PRIEST UPON THE HORNS OF THE ALTAR.** "The blood is the life," and is in this manner brought into the immediate presence of God, symbolized by the altar of burnt offering in the court or incense in the sanctuary. The horns represent the might of the altar, so that to smear them with blood was to carry the offering to the place where the acceptance by God of offerings or praise culminated. Sin dishonours God, and therefore the significance of the offering for sin depends chiefly upon its presentation where God was pleased to vouchsafe his favour to man. Where sin was most dishonouring, as in the event of transgression by the anointed priest, the blood had to be sprinkled before the veil that covered the Shechinah. By his death Christ entered into heaven, presenting his own precious blood to the Father, and now makes intercession as the appointed Mediator.

III. **THE POURING OUT OF THE BLOOD AT THE FOOT OF THE ALTAR OF BURNT OFFERING.** It is said that, at the building of the temple, conduits were constructed to drain the blood into the valley of Kedron; in the wilderness it sufficed to let it flow into the earth. The life of the animal was thus completely surrendered to God. Jesus gave himself up to do the will of God. His self-sacrifice is the basis of ours. We must live, not to ourselves, but to him. He considered not his time, words, works, as his own, and we must regard ourselves as devoted to the Father.

IV. **THE BURNING OF THE FAT.** Thus God would be glorified by the choicest portions, analogous to the ceremony enacted in connection with peace offerings. This resemblance seems designed to teach: 1. That by this sin offering agreement was re-established between God and man. 2. And that God's portion of the victim might be treated in the usual way, the transgression not being on God's side, but on that of man, who therefore is not permitted, as in the peace offering, to eat his part in the enjoyment of a feast. There is thus: 3. A reminder that but for sin man too might have shared in the sacrificial meal with God, but transgression had interrupted the communion, and deprived him of his former privilege. By the obedience unto death of Jesus Christ, God was glorified, and Christ became the "propitiation for our sins."

V. **THE CONSUMPTION OF THE CARCASE BY FIRE OUTSIDE THE CAMP.** No part of the animal was food for man, but the remainder was to be carried to a clean place, and there burnt. Every detail of the ceremony speaks of God's hatred of sin, and the blessings which man thereby loses, and the need for entire devotion of the victim that is to atone for sin. Nothing must be left, lest it should defile. The Epistle to the Hebrews alludes to the fact that Christ suffered without the gates of the holy city; to such a death of shame was he exposed in order to bear our sins.

**CONCLUSION.** Beware of transgression! Behold the sternness of God in dealing with it. Admire his grace in furnishing an expiation, and with grateful love avail yourselves of the sacrifice of the Saviour.—S. R. A.

Vers. 1—3.—*The sin offering for the priest.* The revelations contained in the preceding chapters, and commencing with the words, "And the Lord called unto Moses," etc., appear to have been given at one diet, and now we are introduced to a new series by similar words, "And the Lord spake unto Moses," etc. The offerings described in the earlier series, viz. the burnt offering, the meat offering, and the peace

offering, were similar to those offered by the patriarchs ; but these now to be described seem to be characteristic of the Levitical dispensation. In the verses more immediately before us we have to contemplate—

I. THE PRIEST AS A SINNER. 1. *May he be viewed in this character as a type of Christ?* (1) He is distinguished as “the priest that is anointed.” Some suppose this determines him to be the high priest. That the high priest was a remarkable type of Christ there can be no question (Heb. iii. 1). (2) But Christ was sinless. By the miracle in his birth he avoided original sin (Luke i. 35). In his life he “fulfilled all righteousness” (Matt. iii. 15 ; Heb. iv. 15 ; vii. 26). (3) Yet so was our sin laid to his account that he vicariously stood forth as the universal sinner. “The Lord made to meet upon him the iniquity of us all” (Isa. lxx. 6, margin). 2. *He may be viewed as a type of the Christian.* (1) He was not necessarily the high priest because “anointed.” Aaron’s sons were consecrated with Aaron (ch. viii. 2). This expression may, therefore, simply import that he was a priest who had come to official years, and therefore had received consecration (see ch. vii. 6, where minors and females are reputed to be “among the priests”). (2) The priests in general were representatives of the nation of Israel, who were, in consequence, viewed as a “kingdom of priests” (Exod. xix. 6). (3) And they typified the Christians (1 Pet. ii. 9). We do not exercise our priesthood by proxy, but ourselves “draw nigh unto God.” This supplies a good reason for their being “anointed,” for “Christians,” as their name imports, are *anointed ones* (see 2 Cor. i. 21 ; Heb. i. 9 ; 1 John ii. 20, 27).

II. THE PRIEST AS NEEDING A SIN OFFERING. 1. *His sin is that of ignorance.* (1) The case of Eli could not be brought within this statute (see 1 Sam. iii. 14). For obstinate sin there is no mercy (see Numb. xv. 30, 31 ; Heb. x. 26—29). True Christians do not wilfully sin (see Matt. xiii. 38 ; John viii. 44 ; 1 John iii. 6—10). Not all who profess the Christian name have a right to the title. (2) There are sins that are not wilful : sins of surprise ; sins of inattention ; sins of neglect in consequence (Gal. vi. 1 ; Jas. v. 19, 20). But these are sins. (3) The sin offering is the only remedy for these. Though ignorance may be pleaded in extenuation, it cannot be pleaded in exculpation (see 1 John i. 7—9). 2. *The priest must bring a bullock.* (1) The common people may bring a kid (ver. 28). Even a ruler may bring a kid (ver. 23). But the priest must bring the larger animal. He has to bring the same which is offered for the whole congregation. (2) Much is expected of professors of religion ; and more especially so of office-bearers and ministers. They should have more perfect knowledge in that which is the principal business of their life. They may, from their position, more easily misguide the people. The words in the text rendered “If the priest that is anointed do sin according to the sin of the people,” some construe “If the anointed priest shall lead the people to sin.” It is a fearful thing to be a “blind leader of the blind” (see Rom. ii. 21). (3) Conspicuous men should consider this. Churchwardens in Episcopal Churches ; deacons in Congregationalist Churches ; leaders in Methodist Churches ; ministers in all ; they should watch ; they should pray ; they should seek the prayers of their Churches (Eph. vi. 19 ; Col. iv. 3 ; 1 Thess. v. 25 ; 2 Thess. iii. 1).—J. A. M.

Vers. 1—12.—*The sin offering viewed as typical of the Sacrifice of Calvary.* This subject will be best considered by citing some of the more notable references to it contained in the Scriptures of the New Testament.

I. IT IS EVINCED FROM ROM. VIII. 3 : “For what the Law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin,” i.e. by a sin offering (the Greek term here used is that by which the LXX. commonly translate the Hebrew for “sin offering”), “condemned sin in the flesh,” etc. The “flesh” that was “weak” here, we take to be: 1. *Not our fallen nature.* (1) The word “flesh” is used for this. It is so used in the connection of this very passage (vers. 4—8 ; see also Gal. v. 16, 17). This circumstance has led expositors to accept the term here in that sense. (2) But as a matter of fact, is the Law of God weak through our fallen nature? Certainly not. The Law answers all God ever intended it to answer. His purposes cannot be frustrated. 2. *But the flesh of the sin offerings.* (1) These were constitutionally weak for the purpose of condemning sin. The flesh of bulls and goats is not “sinful flesh.” Therefore sin could not be condemned in it. (2) This

weakness was no frustration of God's purposes, for he never intended that sin should be condemned in such flesh as theirs (Ps. lxxix. 30, 31; li. 16; Heb. x. 4). He intended these to foreshadow something better, viz.: 3. *The Sin Offering of Calvary.* (1) This was made in a *human* body. Being in the "likeness of sinful flesh;" there was no constitutional weakness here (Heb. x. 5—10). (2) The glorious Person who assumed the "likeness of sinful flesh" was God's "own Son." Thus by virtue of his Divinity not only has he condemned sin in the flesh, but he enables us to fulfil the righteousness of the Law in the spirit of the gospel.

II. IT IS EVINCED IN 2 COR. v. 21: "He was made sin," i.e. a sin offering, "for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." 1. *His righteousness is the righteousness of God.* (1) Because he is God himself. The Father was in him. Whoever failed to discern the Father in him did not comprehend him, did not know him (John xiv. 7—11). (2) He was approved of God (Matt. iii. 17; xvii. 5). His resurrection placed this beyond question (Acts ii. 22—24). 2. *This we receive, by imputation, in exchange for our sin.* (1) The transfer of the sin was set forth in the laying on of the hand of the offerer upon the bullock at the altar, while it was yet alive. The Jews give us these as the words uttered by the offerer, "I have sinned; I have done perversely; I have rebelled, and done (here specifying mentally or audibly the cause of his offering). But I return by repentance before thee, and let this be my expiation." (2) The substitute is then condemned while the offerer is justified. Not only is he released from the obligation to die, but is taken into fellowship with God, and feasts with him upon the meat and drink offerings accompanying (Numb. xv. 24).

III. IT IS EVINCED IN HEB. IX. 28: "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin," i.e. without a sin offering, "unto salvation." The allusions here are to the sin offering of the Law. The teaching is that, whereas at his first advent he appeared in the similitude of sinful flesh for the purposes foreshadowed in the sin offering, when he comes the second time it will be in the glorious similitude of humanity, in innocence and holiness, to effect in us all the glories destined to follow upon his former meritorious sufferings (1 Pet. i. 11).

IV. IT IS EVINCED IN HEB. XIII. 10—13: "We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle. For the bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest for sin, are burned without the camp. Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate. Let us go forth, therefore, unto him without the camp, bearing his reproach." 1. This passage, like those already cited, asserts generally the fact that the sin offering was a type of the sacrifice of Christ. 2. But it also points out the typical import of the burning of the body in the place of ashes without the camp. What is this place of ashes but Calvary, Golgotha, the place of a skull, which was outside the gate of Jerusalem? 3. It furthermore proves that the consumption of the body of the beasts in the fire, viz. after they had been bled at the side of the altar, foreshadowed the "suffering" of Christ. "He suffered without the camp." This suffering then being distinguished from that represented by the bleeding, it must refer to that agony of soul which Jesus suffered from the fire of God's wrath against sin. 4. Since the altar which supplies our Eucharistic feast is that of Calvary; and since the priests under the Law did not eat of the bodies of those beasts which were burnt without the camp, which were types of Christ, those who serve the tabernacle have no right to eat of our altar. Therefore those who embrace Christ and rejoice in his fellowship must, in the first place, renounce the ceremonial law of Moses (Gal. ii. 19—21; iii. 1—3).—J. A. M.

Vers. 13—21.—*Sin offering for the congregation.* The congregation of Israel sustained a twofold character, viz. a political and an ecclesiastical; for it was at once a Nation and a Church. Here we have—

I. THE SIN OF A NATION. Ver. 13. 1. *The commandments of the Lord concern nations.* (1) Nations are constituted under the control of his providence. We see this in the account of their origin at Babel (Gen. xi. 6—8). In the teaching of prophecy (Gen. ix. 25—27; xvii. 4, 6, 16). In the inspired review of their history (Acts xvii.

26). (2) God has ever held nations responsible to him (Job xii. 18; Jer. xxvii. 6; Dan. ii. 21; iv. 32). (3) The Hebrew nation more especially so. He raised them up in pursuance of his promise to their fathers. He preserved them in Egypt. He brought them forth with an outstretched arm. He gave them a code of laws at Sinai. He gave them possession of the land of Canaan. In visible symbol he guided their government. (Ps. cxlvii. 19, 20; Rom. ix. 4, 5). 2. *Therefore nations may sin against him.* (1) Where a law is there may be transgression (1 John iii. 4). God has not left himself without witness (Acts xiv. 17). (2) The Gentile nations sinned in throwing off their allegiance to the true God and joining themselves to idols. They have in consequence sunk into the most abominable immoralities (Rom. i. 21—32). (3) The Hebrews followed the bad example of their neighbours. (a) In asking a king to be like them (1 Sam. viii. 7, 8). (b) In their idolatries (1 Kings xii. 26—30; 2 Kings xxi. 11). They became demoralized by licentiousness and violence (Isa. i. 4).

II. THE SIN OF A CHURCH. 1. *The commandments of the Lord concern Churches.* (1) The Church of God in the noblest sense is a grand unity existing throughout the universe and throughout the ages. This is the corporation against which the gates of hell cannot prevail (Matt. xvi. 18). (2) This invisible Church has visible representatives on this earth. The congregation of Israel was such a representative (Acts vii. 38; collate Ps. xxii. 22 with Heb. ii. 12). Now under the gospel these representatives are many. There is a Church where two or three are met together in the name of Jesus. 2. *These Churches are responsible to God.* (1) They have to maintain the purity of faith (Titus iii. 10; 2 John 10; Jude 3; Rev. ii. 13). (2) They have to maintain purity of discipline, viz. by persuasion, by admonition, and by expulsion of incorrigible offenders. Excision in the Jewish Church was accompanied by the infliction of death; for the laws of the nation and those of the Church were one (Exod. xxxi. 14; Numb. xv. 34, 35). Now it means withdrawal from the companionship of the offender (Matt. xviii. 17; Rom. xvi. 17; 1 Cor. v.; 2 Thess. iii. 6, 14; 2 Tim. iii. 5).

III. THE OFFERING FOR SIN. 1. *Communities are punished in this world.* (1) This is evident from the nature of the case. There is no future resurrection of communities. Disintegration to a community is its utter extinction. (2) Nations meet their punishment in adversities which are ordered by Providence. These are the sword (1 Sam. xii. 9—15); the pestilence (Deut. xxviii. 21); the consequence is famine, and wasting, possibly, unto extinction. God stirs up one nation against another to punish its pride (Isa. xli. 2, 25; xlvi. 1—4; xlii. 10; Jer. 1. 21—32). (3) Churches have their punishment in this world. It may come in the form of spiritual leanness. In abandonment to apostacy (Isa. lxvi. 3, 4; 2 Thess. ii. 11). The candlestick may be taken out of its place (Matt. xxi. 41—43; Rev. ii. 5). 2. *Punishment may be averted by sacrifice.* (1) Sacrifices of the Law were concerned with communities. The text furnishes an example. The community may be civil. It may be ecclesiastical. When sacrifice is accepted, no punishment is inflicted. This is the import of the assurance, “It shall be forgiven them.” (2) The sacrifice of Calvary is no less concerned with communities. Churches feel it as well as individuals. Nations feel it as well as Churches. Churches and nations also should plead it far more than they do. 3. *There is no mercy for wilful sin.* (1) To avail ourselves of the benefits of atonement, there must be repentance. This was expressed when the elders of the congregation, on behalf of their constituents, laid their hands upon the bullock (see ver. 15). The gospel of this is obvious. (2) There must also be faith. The faith expressed in the laying on of hands was carried further in the sprinkling of blood (see vers. 16, 18). The veil was a type of Christ, who is our “Way” to God, the “Door” to us into the temple of the Divine Presence (Heb. x. 19, 20). The blood sprinkled upon the veil set forth the laying of our sin upon him who thereby consecrates for us the way. He also is our altar of incense upon whom the blood of our guilt is laid, and by whose intercession we are rendered acceptable to God (1 Pet. ii. 5). (3) Judgment is reserved for the obstinate. When a Church becomes apostate and will not repent, it must be destroyed. Such was the case with Judaism, which was removed amidst the slaughter of the destruction of Jerusalem. Such will be the doom of the Babylonish harlot (Rev. xviii. 4—8). And what hope is there for nations when they become infidel? If sins of ignorance cannot be forgiven without a sin offering, what must be the fate of communities guilty of presumptuous sins!—J. A. M.

Vers. 22—35.—*The sin offering of the ruler and of any of the people.* As in the preceding paragraph we have lessons from the relation of sin offering to communities, here we are reminded—

I. THAT INDIVIDUALS ARE RESPONSIBLE TO GOD. We have: 1. *The responsibility of the ruler.* (1) Rulers stand related to subjects. Their influence is extensive in proportion to the elevation of their rank. The Jews construe this law to relate to the king; but the term for ruler (*נֶזֶר*, *nasi*) is not so restricted in Scripture (see Numb. x. 4). This law was in force 400 years before there existed a king in Israel. (2) As rulers of subjects they stand related to God (Prov. viii. 15, 16; 2 Sam. xxiii. 3). Note: here only, the commandment transgressed is said to be the “commandment of the Lord his God” (ver. 22). This is to remind him that if he rules others, God rules him, and will call him to account for the manner in which he uses his authority. (3) The individual is not sunk in the office. Men are too apt to forget this, particularly so when they sit in conclave. So far from neutralizing, it makes individuality more conspicuous, and should render it more intense. 2. *The responsibility of the private person.* (1) Subjects stand related to rulers. They have relative as well as personal duties. They have public as well as private interests and obligations. (2) They stand as subjects to rulers in relation to God. This is recognized in his laws. (See Exod. xxii. 28; the margin construes the term *נְשִׁיחָה*, rendered “gods,” by “judges.” Magistrates are here presented as representatives of the Elohim.). They are to respect and sustain authority in righteousness (1 Tim. vi. 1). To pray for those in authority (1 Tim. ii. 1, 2). (3) The individual is not sunk in the subject. None are too obscure to be noticed by God; too insignificant to escape his inquisition.

II. THAT SIN OFFERING IS PROVIDED FOR INDIVIDUALS. 1. *It is appointed for the ruler* (vers. 22—26). (1) He has to bring a “kid of the goats,” not a bullock, which was required from the priest and from the congregation. The blood of the kid was to be sprinkled simply upon the horns of the altar of burnt offering, whereas the blood of the bullock was also sprinkled upon the altar of incense and the veil. A further difference was that whereas the bodies of the beasts offered for the priest and for the congregation were burnt without the camp, the kid of the ruler was treated as the peace offering. (2) These differences show that the sin of the ruler, though so heinous as not to be forgiven without sacrifice, was yet not so heinous as that of the priest. More is expected from men of religious profession. Nor was the sin of the ruler regarded as so heinous as that of the congregation. “It is bad when great men give ill examples, but worse when all men follow them” (Matthew Henry). 2. *It is appointed for the common person* (vers. 27—35). (1) Whereas the offering of the ruler is defined to be “a kid of the goats,” that of the private individual may be either a kid or a lamb. As he has more liberty in his sacrifice, so has he in his conduct. Freedom is limited in the ratio of elevation. The humble should not be envious of the great. (2) The offering of the private person was to be a *female*, which was proper to one having no authority; whereas, and for the opposite reason, the ruler had to bring a *male*. (3) These differences go to show that the sin of a ruler is more serious than that of a common person. If his privileges are greater, so are his responsibilities. If his position is elevated, his influence, for good or evil, is proportionately great.

III. THAT SIN OFFERING IS DISCRIMINATIVE. 1. *As to the nature of the sin.* (1) It is for sin *against God*. It seems to have nothing to do immediately with sins against our fellows or against society. These, of course, may be constructively viewed as offences also against God. If this were more considered, men would be more respectful to their fellows, who are “made after the image of God” (see Jas. iii. 9). (2) It is for sin against his negative commandments. This is the teaching of vers. 2, 15, 22, 27. (3) It is for sin *ignorantly* committed against them (see John xvi. 2, 3; Acts iii. 17; 1 Cor. ii. 8). Ignorance is no plea for mercy without sacrifice. It is a plea for mercy *with* a sacrifice (see Luke xxiii. 34; 1 Tim. i. 13). 2. *As to the time of the offering.* (1) “And is guilty,” viz. before the punishment of his sin has come upon him. If he discover his sin in time and bring his sin offering, it may avert that punishment. Men should never try to hide their sins from their own souls. On the contrary, they should diligently seek to discover them. We should plead the sin sacrifice for those we have not discovered (see Ps. xix. 12; cxxxix. 23, 24; 1 John i. 7). (2) “Or if his sin, wherein he hath sinned, come to his knowledge,” viz. by the punishment of it over-

taking him (see 2 Sam. xxxi. 1). When calamity comes we must not too readily relegate it to the category of mere physical sequence, but confess the hand of God. Timely sacrifice may stay a plague (see 2 Sam. xxiv. 25). 3. *For obstinate infidelity there is no mercy.* (1) This is what Paul, alluding to the sin offering, calls *wilful sin* (Heb. x. 26). His argument goes to show that the Great Sacrifice of Calvary is the anti-type of that offering. (2) The Law had no provision of mercy for presumptuous sins, whether the precept outraged were negative or positive (see Numb. xv. 27—31). An awful instance of the severity of the Law is described in Numb. xv. 32—36. This instance is referred to by Paul, who goes on to state that the gospel has its corresponding law of extremity, but with a “much sorcer punishment” (Heb. x. 28, 29). If the extreme penalty of the Mosaic Law was the infliction of death upon the body, what punishment can be “much sorcer” but the “destruction of both body and soul in hell” (Matt. x. 28)?—J. A. M.

Ver. 2.—*The mind of God respecting the sin of man.* “If a soul shall sin.” This chapter which treats of this sin offering, and more especially these words of the second verse, may remind us—

I. **THAT ALL MEN HAVE SINNED, AND ARE GUILTY BEFORE GOD.** The stern facts of the case make the words, “If a soul shall sin,” equivalent to “When a soul sins.” The succeeding chapters provide for all possible cases, as if it were only too certain that men in every station and in every position would sin. So in John we have, “If any man sin,” accompanied by the plain utterance, “If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves,” etc. (1 John i. 8; ii. 1). It is a significant fact that, in providing for the people of God, the Divine Legislator had to contemplate the moral certainty that all, even those standing in his immediate presence and engaged in his worship, would fall into sin and condemnation. This significant provision is only too well confirmed by: 1. The record of Hebrew history. 2. Other statements of Scripture (Ps. xiv. 2, 3; Rom. iii. 10, 23; Gal. iii. 22; 1 John i. 10). 3. Our observation and knowledge of mankind. 4. Our own conscience: every soul does sin in thought, in word, in deed; doing those “things which ought not to be done” (ver. 2), and leaving undone (not thought, not spoken, not fulfilled) those things God righteously requires. “The God in whose hand our breath is, and whose are all our ways, have we not glorified” (Dan. v. 23).

II. **THAT SIN WAS (AND STILL MAY BE) DIVIDED INTO THE PARDONABLE AND UNPARDONABLE.** The words, “If a soul shall sin,” are preparatory to the announcement of Divine provision for pardon. But there is a line drawn between sin and sin. Reference is frequently made to sinning “through ignorance” (vers. 2, 13, 22, 27). This is distinguished from “presumptuous sin” (Numb. xv. 30, 31; Deut. xvii. 12). For the one there was pardon; for the other, instant execution. The word “ignorance” was not confined to mere inadvertence; it extended to sins of unpremeditated folly and passion; probably to all sins but deliberate, high-handed rebellion against God and his Law (ch. xvi. 21; comp. Acts iii. 17; 1 Tim. i. 13). Pardon was provided, but there was a limit to the Divine mercy; there was iniquity for which no sacrifice availed (1 Sam. iii. 14). Under the gospel there is one “unpardonable sin,” the sin “against the Holy Ghost” (Matt. xii. 31, 32). In the time of our Lord, this sin took the special form of blasphemy against the Spirit of God. In our time it resolves itself into a persistent and obdurate resistance of his Divine influence. This necessarily ends in final impenitence and ultimate condemnation. This one sin excepted, the mercy of God in Christ Jesus extends (1) to the blackest crimes; (2) to the longest career in wrong-doing; (3) to the guiltiest disregard of privilege and opportunity.

III. **THAT GOD HAS PROVIDED FOR THE PARDON OF SIN BY SACRIFICE.** It is a striking fact that the same word in Hebrew which signifies sin is also used for “sin offering.” So closely, so intimately in the will of God, and hence in the mind of man, were the two things connected—sin and sacrifice. All unpresumptuous sins might be forgiven, but not without shedding of blood. Sin, in God’s thought, means death, and the sinner must be made to feel that, as such, he is worthy of death. Hence he must bring the animal from his herd or flock, and it must be slain, the guilt of the offerer having been solemnly confessed over, and (by imputation) formally conveyed to the victim’s head. The life of the one for the life of the other. Doubtless it sufficed for the time and for the purpose, but it was not the redemption which a guilty race needed,

and which a God of boundless peace was intending and was thus preparing to supply. The sin offering was prophetic, symbolical. The blood of bulls could not take away the sin of the world; only the slain Lamb of God would avail for that (Heb. x. 4; John i. 29). But "the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from *all* sin;" "If *any* man sin, . . . he is the propitiation for our sins . . . for the sins of the whole world" (1 John i. 7; ii. 1, 2). "He hath made him to be sin (a sin offering) for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made," etc. (2 Cor. v. 21). We learn from the foregoing: 1. The one great and deep want of the world. We *have* bodies that need to be clothed, fed, etc., but this is nothing to the fact that we *are* souls that have sinned, needing to be forgiven and accepted of God. 2. The inestimable advantages we now enjoy. If the Jew had great advantages over the Gentile, we are far more privileged than he. There has been offered for us "one sacrifice for sins for ever" (Heb. x. 12), available for all souls, under the heaviest condemnation, for all time. 3. Our proportionate guilt if we are negligent (Heb. x. 29).—C.

Vers. 3, 13, 22, 27.—*Gradations in guilt.* In Israel, as we have seen, sin was divided into the pardonable and the unpardonable—into "sins through ignorance" and sins of presumption. But this was not the only distinction. Of those which might be forgiven there were some more serious than others, demanding variety in expiation. Special regulations were given as to the sin of the "priest that is anointed" (ver. 3), the "whole congregation of Israel" (ver. 13), the ruler (ver. 22), etc. These distinctions teach us—

I. THAT SPECIAL PRIVILEGE CARRIES WITH IT PECULIAR RESPONSIBILITY. The high priest, if he sinned, was to bring a bullock without blemish (ver. 3), and every detail of the sin offering was to be carefully observed in his case (vers. 4, 5, etc.). His transgression was accounted one of greater guilt, needing a more considerable sacrifice. His nearer access to God, his larger share of sacred privilege, made his accountability and his guilt the greater. The children of privilege are the heirs of responsibility; the more we have from God, the closer we are admitted to his presence, the clearer vision we have of his truth and will,—the more he expects from us, and the more heinous will be our guilt in his sight if we depart from his ways.

II. THAT THE PROFESSION OF PIETY CARRIES WITH IT INCREASE OF OBLIGATION. The high priest's enlarged accountability was partly due to the fact that, as high priest, he professed to stand in very close relation to God; he was, in public estimation, the first minister of Jehovah; he was regarded as the holiest man in the whole congregation. Special obligation, therefore, rested on him, and any slight irregularity on his part was most serious. Profession of godliness is a good and desirable thing. 1. It is the *right* thing: it places us in the position in which we ought to stand; it is being true to ourselves. 2. It is the will of Christ as revealed in his Word (Matt. x. 32). 3. It adds to our influence on behalf of righteousness and wisdom. 4. It is an additional security against the power of temptation. But it enhances responsibility; it increases obligation. For if, professing to love and honour Christ, we do that which he has expressly forbidden, we bring his sacred cause into contempt, and "make the enemy to blaspheme." Rise to the full height of duty, influence, privilege, but remember that on that height are some special dangers, and that a fall therefrom is to be dreaded with holy fear, to be shunned with devoutest vigilance.

III. THAT INFLUENCE CONFERS ADDED RESPONSIBILITY ON THOSE WHO WIELD IT. Special provision is made for the sin of the ruler, "When a ruler hath sinned," etc. (vers. 22, 23, etc.). A ruler enjoys a position of prominence and power; his influence is felt afar. What he does will decide, to some considerable extent, what others will do. He has the peculiar joy of power; let him remember that power and responsibility are inseparably united. Let all those who hold positions of influence, all whose judgment and behaviour are importantly affecting the convictions and character of their fellows, realize that if they sin, and thus encourage others in error and transgression, they are specially guilty in the sight of God.

IV. THAT COMMUNITIES OF MEN, AS SUCH, MAY FALL INTO SERIOUS CONDEMNATION. "The whole congregation of Israel" might "sin through ignorance;" it might be led, unwittingly, into practices that were forbidden. In that case, though men have great confidence when they err in large companies, it would be guilty before God; and though

it might be inadvertently betrayed into folly, it would be condemned of him, and must bring its oblation to his altar (see Homily on "Collective," etc., *infra*).

V. **THAT NO MEASURE OF OBSCURITY WILL CLOAK SIN FROM THE SIGHT OF GOD.** "If any one of the common people sin through ignorance," etc. (ver 27, etc.), he must bring his kid (ver. 28) or his lamb (ver. 32), and the stoning blood must be shed. We shall not escape in the throng. In the hundreds of millions of fellow-travellers along the path of life, God singles each of us out, and marks our course, and searches our soul. He esteems every human child, however disregarded of men, to be worthy of his watchful glance; is displeased with each sinful deed or word, but is ready to forgive when the penitent seeks mercy in the appointed way (vers. 31, 35).—C.

Vers. 13, 14.—*Collective guilt unconsciously incurred.* We learn from the special provision made for the "sin in ignorance" of "the whole congregation of Israel"—

I. **THAT, THOUGH GOD DEALS PRIMARILY WITH INDIVIDUAL SOULS, HE HAS DIRECT RELATIONS WITH COMMUNITIES.** Ordinarily, constantly, God comes to the individual soul, and says, "Thou shalt" or "Thou shalt not;" "My Son," do this and live, etc. But he has his Divine dealings with societies, with secular and sacred communities also; with (1) nations, (2) Churches, (3) families.

II. **THAT COMMUNITIES, AS SUCH, MAY INCUR HIS CONDEMNATION.** A "whole congregation," an entire people, may sin (ver. 13). 1. The nation: witness the Jewish people, again and again denounced and punished. 2. The Church: witness the Churches of Galatia (Epist. to Gal.), the Churches of Asia Minor (Rev. ii., iii.). 3. The family.

III. **THAT THIS GUILT MAY BE CONTRACTED UNCONSCIOUSLY.** "The thing be hid from the eyes of the assembly" (ver. 13). 1. *The Jewish nation*, "through ignorance, killed the Prince of Life" (Acts iii. 15, 17). Under some of the better and worthier emperors as well as under the viler, Rome martyred the Christians, thinking them injurious to that human race which they were regenerating. 2. *The Church of Christ* has unconsciously fallen, at different times and places into (1) error, (2) laxity of conduct, (3) unspirituality in worship and life, (4) inactivity. 3. *Families* fall into (1) undevoutness of habit; (2) unneighbourliness and inconsiderateness; (3) ungraciousness of tone, and unkindness of behaviour in the home circle.

IV. **THAT RECOGNITION OF WRONG MUST BE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWED BY PENTITENCE AND FAITH.** When "the sin was known," the congregation was to "offer a young bullock," etc. (ver. 14). Let every nation, Church, society, family: 1. Remember that it is fallible, and may fall unconsciously into sin. 2. Readily, and with open mind, receive expostulation and warning from others. 3. Upon conviction of wrong, resort in penitence and faith to the all-sufficient Sacrifice of which the sin offering was the type.—C.

Vers. 11, 12.—*Full acceptance with God.* The carrying away of all the offered animal (save that part which had been presented to God in sacrifice) and the burning of it in "a clean place" (ver. 12), was probably meant to represent the full and perfect acceptance of the offerer by the Holy One of Israel. When the victim had been slain and its blood outpoured on the altar and its richest part accepted in sacrifice, there might seem to have been sufficient indication of Divine mercy. But one sign more was added: the animal which represented the worshipper having shed its blood, and that shed blood having been received as an expiation, it became holy; when, therefore, its flesh was not eaten by the priest (ch. vi. 26) in token of its sanctity, every part of the animal was solemnly and reverently consumed, in "a clean place." Nothing pertaining to that which had become holy through the shed blood should be treated as an unholy thing. Looked at in this light, we gain the valuable thought that when sin has been forgiven through faith in the shed blood of the Redeemer, the sinner is regarded as holy in the sight of God. As everything was thus done by pictorial representation to express the thought of the fulness of Divine forgiveness, so everything was stated in explicit language through the psalmists and prophets to the same effect (Exod. xxxiv. 6, 7; Ps. lxxxvi. 5, 15; ciii. 8; cxlv. 8; Isa. i. 18; lv. 7). So, also, our Lord, in the "prince of parables," included everything that could be introduced—the robe, the ring, the shoes, the fatted calf—to present in the strongest colouring the precious truth that

God does not grudgingly or imperfectly forgive, but that he “*abundantly pardons*.” The subject demands our consideration of two things—

I. **THE FULNESS OF GOD'S ACCEPTANCE.** God's mercy in Christ Jesus embraces: 1. The entire forgiveness of all past sins, so that all our numerous transgressions of his Law, both the more heinous and the less guilty, are “blotted out” of his “book of remembrance,” and no more regarded by him; and so that all our more numerous shortcomings, our failure to be and to do that which the heavenly Father looked for from his children, are entirely forgiven. 2. The overlooking of our present unworthiness; so that the scantiness of our knowledge, the imperfection of our penitence, the feebleness of our faith, the poverty of our resolutions, and our general unworthiness do not stand in the way of his “benign regard.” 3. The bestowment of his Divine complacency; so that he not only “receives us graciously,” but “loves us freely” (Hos. xiv. 2, 4). He feels toward us the love and the delight which a father feels toward the children of his heart and his home. But to gain this inestimable blessing, let us be sure that we have fulfilled—

II. **THE CONDITIONS ON WHICH IT IS BESTOWED.** These are twofold. Paul has expressed them thus: (1) repentance toward God; and (2) faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ (Acts xx. 21). He who inspired Paul has taught us the same truth in his own words (Luke xxiv. 47; Acts xxvi. 18). There must be the turning of the heart, in shame and sorrow, from sin unto God, and the cordial acceptance of the Lord Jesus Christ as the Divine Teacher, the all-sufficient Saviour, the rightful Lord of heart and life, which he claims to be.—C.

Vers. 3, 13, 22, 27.—*Access for all: comparison and contrast.* In the statutes of the Law given in this chapter we are reminded, by comparison and by contrast, of two of the main features of the gospel of Christ. We are reminded by comparison of—

I. **THE ACCESS THAT WAS PERMITTED TO EVERY ISRAELITE, AND IS NOW GRANTED TO US.** No single individual in the whole congregation of Israel could feel that he was forbidden to go with his offering “before the Lord,” to seek forgiveness of his sin. The priest could not think his office stood in his way (ver. 3); nor the ruler his function (ver. 22); nor could any humble son of Abraham suppose himself too obscure to find attention at the door of the tabernacle (ver. 27). Special and explicit legislation provided for each case, and there could not have been one Hebrew family which did not know that the tabernacle of the Lord was open to all, and that on the altar of sacrifice every offender might have his offering presented and come “down to his house justified.” Thus broad, and indeed broader still, is the permission to approach which is granted in the gospel. For not only is the Christian sanctuary open to prince and people, to minister and member, to every class and rank, but in Christ Jesus there is neither circumcision nor uncircumcision, neither Greek nor Jew, neither male nor female; every distinction of every kind has disappeared, and is utterly unknown. We are reminded by contrast of—

II. **THAT ACCESS WHICH WAS DENIED TO THEM, BUT WHICH IS OFFERED TO US.** The ordinary Jew, one of the “common people,” could go no further than the “door of the tabernacle;” there his entrance was barred. At that point he had to leave everything to the officiating priest; it was not permitted to him to enter the holy place, to sprinkle the blood upon the altar, to present any part of the victim in sacrifice;—another must do that in his stead. But in Christ Jesus we have: 1. Access to God our Father in every place (Eph. ii. 18; iii. 12; Heb. xiii. 16). 2. Right to plead, ourselves, the one Great Propitiation for sin. 3. Right to present ourselves and our gifts on his altar to God and his service (Rom. xii. 1; Heb. xiii. 16). 4. Access to the table of the Lord (1 Cor. xi. 28). Let us try to realize (1) the height of our Christian privilege, and (2) the corresponding weight of the responsibility we bear. From us to whom such full and close access is given will much fruit be required to the glory of his Name, in the growth of our own souls and the salvation of others.—C.

Vers. 1, 2.—*The sin offering.* The main points in this offering were these: I. The Law of God is made the standard of righteousness. II. Sin is offence against the Law. III. Offences of ignorance or error involve guilt; that is, require that the Law

shall be honoured in view of them. IV. There is forgiveness with God for all sin. V. Those who are in the most responsible position are the most called to offer sacrifice for their sin. VI. The forgiveness of sin is only through expiation, in recognition of an atonement. These points embrace much of the teaching of the Mosaic economy. Consider—

I. **THE LAW OF GOD THE STANDARD OF RIGHTEOUSNESS.** The sin which has to be expiated is "*sin against any of the commandments of the Lord.*" While distinction was plainly made from the first between the fundamental moral law, as in the ten commandments, and the ceremonial law—still all that was "*commanded of the Lord*" was law to Israel—was to be strictly observed, involved the covenant relation between God and man, to violate which was to be estranged from the peace of God. The ceremonial law, taken in connection with the Decalogue and the whole of the Mosaic appointments, set forth this great truth, that the existence of man in all its extent was subject to the will of God, and that that will as declared was law, which must be obeyed at peril of Divine displeasure. So there is still the same subjection of man to *law*, which is: 1. The *law of the heart* or of the inward man. 2. The *law of ethics*, of man's relations to his fellow-man. 3. The *law of the religious life*, of man's worship of God. The *standard of righteousness* must be applied in each of these spheres of Law, which our Lord shows by his Sermon on the Mount, when he proclaims the will of God to be holiness in all these respects—*poverty and purity of heart, love to neighbours, sincerity and devotion in the worship of God.* Against the Law any offence is sin. Therefore, as the gospel was a new proclamation of the Law, so was it a new revelation of sin; for Christ, by the Spirit, came to "*convince the world of sin,*" by revealing the law of righteousness.

II. **SIN IS OFFENCE AGAINST THE LAW.** The fundamental conception of the Mosaic economy was the fellowship of God and man—the true blessedness of human existence. The Law was a setting out of the boundaries of that ground of fellowship where alone God and man could meet together. Whether it was civil law, or moral law, or ceremonial law, the same twofold reference was in each to the will of God as Creator, King, Redeemer, to the trustful subjection of man to Divine authority. An offence against Law in this wide sense of the word must include not only a deliberate setting up of the will of the creature against the Creator as in immorality or intentional disobedience of any kind, but anything in the conduct which hinders the fulfilment of the Divine purposes, anything which opposes the Law as an active principle. We recognize the same universality of sanction to law in that inevitability which we attach to the laws of nature, whether physical or social. They work out their results both in the individual and in society, apart from all respect of persons. The good man violating a law of nature must suffer the consequences. Not because he is punished by the God of providence, but because he has put himself in the way of the great chariot of the world's onward progress, and has become so far an offence and a stumbling-block, which must be treated as such. It was a grand advance in revelation that all human life was regarded as based upon law, and all law was declared to be God's Law. Therefore, all rightness, all happiness, both positive and negative, must be from God, the fruit of a living fellowship between the creature and the Creator.

III. **EXTENSION OF GUILT TO OFFENCES OF IGNORANCE AND ERROR.** The word rendered *ignorance* signifies wandering from the way. Therefore the idea of the offence is not that of absolute ignorance of the Law itself, which would exclude the idea of guilt altogether, but rather that of inadvertence, through carelessness, through human infirmity of any kind, or through the connection of our own life with the life of others. "There are many things which man's conscience would pass over, many things which might escape man's cognizance, many things which his heart might deem all right, which God could not tolerate; and which, as a consequence, would interfere with man's approach to, his worship of, and his relationship with God" (Macintosh). Hence the need of a Divine atonement—for as David prays we must all pray, "*Cleanse thou me from secret faults*" (Ps. xix. 12). Now, the sin offering pointed to the fact that such secret faults, unintentional violations of the Law, involved guilt, inasmuch as they were occasions demanding that the Law should be vindicated and honoured as truly as the greatest offences. This has been universally recognized in the law of nations as a natural principle of justice. The overt act is alone before the eye of the law, not the

secret intention except as it changes the character of the overt act. The offence of manslaughter embraces a large number of cases where ignorance and error might be pleaded, but are not sufficient to remove the liability of the offender. Guilt is not merely conscious or subjective liability to punishment, but objective liability as well. Thus is the conscience of man enlightened and its power enlarged by the revelation of God. As Adam knew his sin much more clearly when God had called him into colloquy, so the Law of Moses was an appeal to the conscience, a quickening of it, a setting up of the Divine mirror before man, that he might know himself. See this whole doctrine of guilt treated by St. Paul in Rom. vii., "Sin by the commandment became exceeding sinful." "I was alive without the Law once, but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died."

**IV. THE OFFERING FOR SIN IS THE PLEDGE OF DIVINE FORGIVENESS.** The sin of ignorance represented God's view of sin as contrasted with man's view. Therefore, as it was an atoning offering, it proclaimed both the righteousness of God as condemning *all* sin, and the covenant mercy of God as forgiving *all* sin. Man would naturally take account only of known sins, but the true peace is that which proceeds from the assurance of entire and infinite atonement. How different is such a revelation of mercy from any of the heathen satisfactions which were mere attempts to appease the Divine wrath as a recognized danger! But dangers are not only seen, but unseen. In the case of natural laws, how often we find that we have broken them when we knew not! The true safety is that which we know is not only partial and probable, but absolutely secured against all possible contingencies. God's thoughts are not as our thoughts. He invites us to hide under the shadow of his wings.

**V. RESPONSIBILITY IN PROPORTION TO PRIVILEGE.** The priest represented the people. The congregation was the nation in its collective capacity, therefore it represented not only the individuals as sinners, but the special relation of the community to Jehovah as the body to the head. The official position of the high priest was one of peculiar dignity and solemnity, therefore the sin of the individual in his case was more than his own sin—it was the violation of that larger relation in which the people as a whole stood to their God. All superior knowledge, all elevation of office and vocation, all representation, carries with it special responsibility. Those who are ministers of God must feel their sins as heavier burdens, requiring to be put away by special acknowledgment, by extraordinary effort. There are sins which none but the high priest and the congregation could commit. So there are sins of official life and sins of Church life, which we are apt to overlook because they are less upon the individual conscience than our own personal sins; but God shows us by the regulations of his Law, that we must hate them and avoid them and seek their forgiveness, even as though they were deliberate and individual offences. How often men have done, in the name of their religious system or in their official capacity, what, if it had been ascribed to themselves in their private life, they would have immediately condemned! The purity of Church officers and of Church life in general has much to do with the growth of Christianity. The history of ecclesiastical errors is a very sad one. It was the absolute purity of Christ which so severely condemned the religious leaders of his time. They suffered their consciences to be blinded by the corruption of the system under which they lived. They did evil, thinking often that they did God service. Yet the Church and its rulers will be judged, not by the standard of its own degeneracy, but by the Law of God. Judgment begins at the house of God. *There are the most responsible men, there are the greatest offences, and there must be the most exemplary manifestation of Divine righteousness.* The clearing away of sin from the Church is the preparation for the pure worship of God, for the re-established relation between the covenant king and his people, for the outpoured blessings of the throne of grace.

**VI. THE FORGIVENESS OF SIN, ONLY BY EXPIATION, THROUGH ATONEMENT.** This is especially set forth by the sin offering, for it represented the Divine demand of expiation in cases where human ignorance or error might be pleaded in excuse on man's side. What we require is not mere proclamation of pardon, but a peace which is settled on eternal foundations. So long as there remains in the mind of the sinner the thought that God is not satisfied, there must be a barrier to fellowship. The setting forth of the sin offering was a provision of Divine righteousness as the condition of peace. God does not overlook sin as that which has excuse made for it; he puts it away as that

which is atoned for. All the details of the ceremony, especially the connection of the blood of the sin offering with the two altars—that of incense and that of burnt offering—pointed to the completeness of the atonement which God provided. In the antitype, the great sacrifice offered by our Lord Jesus Christ, whose soul was made an offering for sin, we must lay great stress on the Divine perfection of the Victim offered, his coming forth from God, his representation in himself of Divine righteousness; for Christ is not a Saviour merely from individual transgressions, but from sin itself as an evil principle at work in the nature of man. Unless we hold firmly to this atoning perfection of Christ, we cannot proclaim the regenerating gift of the Holy Spirit, for the new life must be founded in a perfect justification; the same faith which admits us into the forgiveness of sins through the blood of Christ, also admits us into that fellowship and vital union with the living Redeemer, which is the commencement of a new life in the Spirit. The Apostle Peter (1 Pet. i. 2) puts the sanctification of the Spirit and the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ in juxtaposition. They are included in the one Sacrifice of Calvary, whereby atonement is made, and the power of an endless life is revealed in him who, having offered himself through the Spirit without spot, rose again from the dead to become the Captain of salvation, the Firstborn among many brethren, the second Adam, the man who is made, by his Divine work, a quickening spirit. “Christ is God’s,” and “ye are Christ’s.”—R.

**Vers. 3—12.—*The high priest’s burnt offering.*** The difference between the high priest’s offering and that for the whole congregation on the one hand, and the offering for an offending ruler or any of the common people on the other, lay in the sprinkling of the blood of the victim seven times before the Lord, before the veil of the sanctuary. This betokened the purifying by this sacrifice of the public worship of the people as distinguished from their private and individual life. The different modes of sprinkling the blood marked successive degrees of consecration, from the altar of burnt offering without to the veil in the sanctuary, which especially represented Jehovah’s presence. The high priest was an embodiment of the people’s sanctity as a worshipping people. The great truth taught is the necessity of connecting together worship with the revelation of Divine righteousness and grace. The only true religion is that which rests on the twofold basis—God’s provided atonement for sin; man’s faith and obedience towards God.

**SHOW THAT THERE IS “INIQUITY IN OUR HOLY THINGS.”** This was recognized by the Apostle Paul at Athens. “Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you.” The want of true knowledge renders the worship unacceptable. But not ignorance only; indifference, heedlessness, the superstition which proceeds from a corrupt heart, the falsehood which has grown up from the root of sin in human nature and which the individual man may adopt from tradition without perceiving its falsity. The religious leaders of a people may be especially guilty of defiling the popular worship. The priest, by his false theology, or his corrupt ritual, or his lack of spirituality, may involve the congregation in sin. In the house of God itself there may be sinful defect of reverence, sinful disorder, sinful coldness and dulness, sinful pride and worldliness, sinful wanderings of thought and self-assertion. Our worship needs to be sprinkled with the blood of our Great Sacrifice before it can be accepted. It is especially incumbent on the religious teachers and ministers of the sanctuary that they be prominent in confessing sin, in urging the necessity of more sanctification, in exalting the merit of Christ that worship be presented through him.—R.

**Vers. 13—21.—*The whole congregation sinners through ignorance.*** The sacrifice is very similar to the high priest’s. The ruling thought in both cases is that of sin attaching to those who represent the covenant of God. The people, whether as a nation or assembly, or as a house of God, a worshipping congregation, whether in its elders or rulers, or in its high priest, were in a covenant relation to Jehovah; therefore might offend against that relation, and required atonement to be made. Take up the subject of *national sins*.

**I. A NATION MAY BE GUILTY.** 1. *Negatively*, violating the commandments of God. Political unwisdom, producing national disorder, ignorance, division of classes from one another, decay of commerce, and distress. International confusion and war. 2.

*Positively irreligious.* Growth of vices till they become national. Combinations of great masses of people to uphold wrong and protect interests which impede the advance of morality. Sins of rulers in dishonest legislation. State interference with religious liberty. Spread of superstition, for which the nation as a whole is accountable. Indifference of the more privileged classes to the moral and religious condition of the multitudes. Guilty leaders followed.

**II. NATIONAL SINS SHOULD BE NATIONALLY CONFESSED AND PUT AWAY.** While there are prominent members of the nation who should set an example of penitence and sacrifice, the whole people should be summoned to a united acknowledgment of their position before God. The national fast, if rightly conducted, and emanating from a widespread sense of sin, and not from a mere royal command, must be pleasing to God. At such times the chief stress should be laid not upon the performance of external rites, but upon the facts of the moral state of the people and the gospel call to repentance and faith.

**III. THERE IS A FORGIVENESS OF NATIONS AS WELL AS OF INDIVIDUALS.** “And the priest shall make an atonement for them, and it shall be forgiven them.” We cannot doubt that God, as a Moral Governor, punishes nations. History proves that there is not a mere natural rise and fall of great powers by the working of ordinary physical, social, and economical laws; but there is an ordering of events, so as to visit national sins upon nations. Great illustrations: in France; in United States for slavery; in our own history, Spanish Armada—“Afflavit Deus, et dissipantur.” Many instances of change for the better in affairs of nations: France, Italy, America, England at the Commonwealth. Preservation from impending evils. Special help in internal troubles and international relations. We must watch the will of Providence over long periods, and adapt facts and principles to one another. Testimony in the Old Testament, and especially in the Psalms, to the government of God in nations.—R.

**Vers. 22—26.—A ruler can sin through ignorance, and requires atonement.** **I. OFFICIAL POSITION IS MORAL RESPONSIBILITY.** Whether the office be inherited or appointed, the ruler is in a special relation to God and to the people. He must jealously guard his office, and the more exalted he is, the more he should preserve a conscience void of offence towards God and towards man.

**II. THE RULER SHOULD SET THE EXAMPLE** of respecting the requirements of God’s Law. If the people see their natural leaders and official superiors confessing sin and seeking atonement, religious reverence and obedience will spread through all classes. Fearful curse of wicked rulers. Those in high positions should search their lives and hearts, lest, by their neglect, or ignorance, or sin of any kind, they bring Divine displeasure on the people.

**III. The sacrifice is not the same for the ruler as for the man.** **An OFFICIAL POSITION IS NOT TO HIDE AN INDIVIDUAL AND PERSONAL ACCOUNTABILITY.** Too often sins are committed in office, of which men would be ashamed if their own names were connected with them. We may distinguish the official from the personal, but we must remember that God requires both to be pure and holy.—R.

**Vers. 27—35.—The sins of the common people.** The idea of the distinction is that those who, by their distance from the sanctuary and their lack of education, are more exposed to the possibility of offence, are less guilty, and therefore require a somewhat lower sacrifice. A female kid or a lamb would suffice; but the same ceremonies were indispensable—the laying on of hands, the touching of the horns of the altar of burnt offering with blood, the pouring out of the blood at the bottom of the altar, the fire offering of sweet savour to the Lord. Thus the least sins, the sins of the least responsible people, the sins of ignorance and mere ceremonial uncleanness, were connected with the greatest, and the people were reminded that all sin, as transgression of the Law, must be atoned for, and without atonement there is no forgiveness. Subject—*Sins of the common people.*

**I.** We are taught to **DEAL WITH THEM FITFULLY**, with consideration of circumstances, with remembrance of their comparative lesser guilt. Mere denunciations, unqualified condemnation, injurious. We should teach people the Law that they may see the sinfulness of sin, but in the spirit of love, lest they be blinded and hardened by

a bewildering confusion of conscience and despondency. The traditional condemnation attached to those sins to which the masses are especially tempted might mislead, if not modified by the respect to antecedents.

II. We must hold fast to the Scripture representation—**ALL SIN IS GUILT**. The attempt to uplift the lower classes, without the power of atonement, by means of mere moral or intellectual appliances or social influences, must be a failure in the long run. Those who make it injure themselves. Nothing delivers them from sin but the power of Christ. Nor will it avail to imitate the folly which “*makes light of sin*.” Cf. the Saviour’s instructions in Sermon on the Mount (Matt. vii.). While we avoid censoriousness and uncharitable judgment, we must cultivate a wise caution, lest we cast our pearls before swine. The Spirit of Christ is our only guide and strength.

III. The prescriptions of the Law varied according to the opportunity of the offender. We must **SMOOTH THE WAY FOR RETURN TO GOD**. By adapting the commandments to the capacity and opportunity of men. By teaching them the spirituality of the gospel method, which lays the chief stress on motive and affection, not on mere external value in the gift. By sympathy and co-operation helping them to find the way, holding them up in it for a time, surrounding them with cheerful companionship and encouraging words.

IV. The common people being thus marked out, reminds us that there is a special urgency upon the Christian Church in **THE MISSION OF THE GOSPEL TO THOSE THAT ARE AFAR OFF**. We are apt to think it enough to care for those in and about the temple. The common people heard Jesus gladly. To the poor his gospel is especially preached. If all the sacrifices typify the Great Sacrifice of Calvary, and the sin offering more particularly, the adaptation of the doctrine of Christ to the masses is thus set forth; we must present the sin offering, if we would redeem society from its teeming miseria.

## EXPOSITION.

### CHAPTER V.

**THE SIN OFFERING—continued** (vers. 1-13). The subject of the next thirteen verses is still the sin offering, not the trespass offering, as has been supposed by some. The first six verses state three specific cases for which sin offerings are required, and the remaining seven verses detail the concessions made to poverty in respect to the offerings required. The cases are those of a witness, of one ceremonially defiled, and of one who had sworn thoughtlessly. The concessions granted are two: two turtle-doves or young pigeons are allowed instead of a lamb, and the tenth part of an ephah of fine flour, without oil or frankincense, is allowed instead of the two turtle-doves or young pigeons. The latter concession is the more remarkable as the sacrifice by its means changes its character from a bloody to an unbloody offering.

Ver. 1.—The case of a witness on oath. If a man hear the voice of swearing, that is, if he was one of a number of persons adjured to speak according to the manner in which oaths were administered in Jewish courts of justice (see Matt. xxvi. 63; 2 Chron. xviii. 15),

and he did not give evidence of what he had seen or heard, he had to bear his iniquity, that is, he was regarded as guilty; and as this was an offence which could be atoned for by a sacrifice, he was to offer as a sin offering a ewe lamb, or a female kid, or two turtle-doves, or two pigeons, or the tenth part of an ephah of flour. This injunction is a direct condemnation of the approved teaching of Italian moral theologians of paramount authority throughout the Roman Church, who maintain that, in case a crime is not known to others, a witness in a court of justice “may, nay, he is bound to, say that the accused has not committed it” (St. Alfonso de’ Liguori, ‘Theol. Mor.’ iv. 154).

Ver. 2, 3.—Two cases of a man ceremonially defiled. If he had touched a dead body or any other substance conveying uncleanness, and it were hidden from him, that is, if he had done it unwittingly, or from forgetfulness or neglect, had failed to purify himself immediately, he must offer his sin offering, as above.

Ver. 4.—The case of a man who had neglected to fulfil a thoughtless oath. If he aware to do evil, or to do good, that is, to do anything whatever, good or bad (see Numb. xxiv. 13), and failed to fulfil his oath from carelessness or negligence, he too must bring his offering, as above.

Ver. 5, 6.—In the four cases last men-

tioned there is first to be an acknowledgment of guilt, he shall confess that he hath sinned in that thing, and then the sin offering is to be made. Confession of sin probably preceded or accompanied all sin offerings. The use of the word *asham*, translated *trespass offering* in ver. 6, and the character of the four cases have led many commentators to regard vers. 1-13 as dealing with the *trespass offering* rather than the *sin offering*. But if this were so, the words *trespass offering* and *sin offering* would be used synonymously in this verse, which is very unlikely, when they are immediately afterwards carefully distinguished. It is best to render *asham* "for his trespass," that is, in expiation of his guilt, as in the next verse, in place of a *trespass offering*.

Vers. 7-13.—If he be not able to bring a lamb. Sin offerings being not voluntary sacrifices but required of all that were

guilty, and the four last-named cases being of common occurrence amongst the poor and ignorant, two concessions are made to poverty: two birds (one to be offered with the ritual of the sin offering, the other with that of the burnt offering), or even some flour (either three pints and a half or three quarts and a half, according as we adopt the larger or smaller estimate of the amount of the ephah), are allowed when the offerer cannot provide a lamb or a kid. There is thus typically set forth the freedom with which acceptance through the great propitiation is offered to all without respect of persons. The non-bloody substitute, being permitted only as an exception for the benefit of the very poor and only in the four cases above specified, does not invalidate the general rule that without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sin.

#### HOMILETICS.

Ver. 5.—*Confession of the sin committed* is required of the man who is allowed to offer a sin offering. It is likewise required before a *trespass offering* is accepted, as appears from Numb. v. 6, 7. "When a man or woman shall commit any sin that men commit, to do a *trespass* against the Lord, and that person be guilty, then they shall confess their sin that they have done."

I. TRADITIONAL FORM OF CONFESSION. "The sacrifice was so set, as that the offerer, standing with his face towards the west, laid his two hands between his horns and confessed his sin over a sin offering and his trespass over a *trespass offering*; and his confession was on this wise: 'I have sinned, I have done grievously, I have rebelled and done thus and thus; but I return by repentance before thee, and let this be my expiation'" (Lightfoot, 'Temple Service,' ch. viii.). "I beseech thee, O Lord; I have sinned, I have transgressed, I have rebelled, I have (here the person specified the particular sin which he had committed, and for which he wanted expiation); but now I repent, and let this be my expiation" (Outram, 'De Sacrificiis,' I. xv. 9). That some such form as this was used, according to the universal tradition of the Jews, we may conclude with tolerable certainty from the present passage in Leviticus and that in Numb. v. 6, 7.

II. THIS CONFESSION WAS INTENDED TO SPRING FROM FEELINGS OF REPENTANCE. All that could be enforced as a common and public discipline was the open confession of the sin. But no Israelite could have believed that the confession would be acceptable unless it proceeded from a penitent heart. This was left, as it must be left, to the individual conscience, but it was suggested and morally demanded by the injunction to confess.

III. THE OFFERING OF THE SIN OFFERING AND TRESPASS OFFERING WAS NOT THEREFORE AN EXTERNAL CEREMONY ONLY, BUT A SPIRITUAL PENITENTIAL ACT. As the offering of the burnt offering implied the spiritual act of self-surrender, and of the meat offering the spiritual act of submission, and of the peace offering the spiritual act of holy joy, so the offering of the sin and trespass offering implies the spiritual act of repentance. None of these sacrifices perform their work as *opera operata*, without reference to the religious state of the offerer's mind and soul.

Vers. 7-13.—The sacrifices to be offered as sin offerings are specified, nor may they be multiplied. They do not differ according to the heinousness of the offence which they are to atone for, but according to the means of the offerer. The moral reason of this was probably to prevent the idea arising that the costliness of the sacrifice might compensate for the greater sin, and that men might sin the more if they were willing to pay for it by more sacrifices. The difference in the sacrifice appointed for each class

might serve to point out that a sin is greater in a man of prominent position than in a man of less influence, owing to its effects upon a larger circle. The concession made to the poor shows that none are to be shut out from communion with God for their want of worldly means. The expiation must be made, that the sinner may recover his covenant relations with God; but it shall be of such a nature that none shall be prevented from making it by their poverty. Here then is a foreshadowing of the free grace of God in the gospel dispensation. "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; come ye, buy and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price" (Isa. lv. i.). "Let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely" (Rev. xxii. 17).

### HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

Vers. 1-13.—*Guilt removed.* The Psalmist cried out, "Who can understand his errors? cleanse thou me from secret faults." To dwell upon the manner in which sin may be committed, and to try to deepen our sense of its flagrancy, is not a pleasant employment, but it is highly necessary. And, blessed be God! a rainbow of cheerful hope spans the dark cloud of transgression; the same page that speaks of sin tells also of forgiveness.

I. This chapter reminds the Israelites of several ways in which, without having been resolutely determined upon, sin might result. Through silence and concealment of knowledge (ver. 1), through defilement by contact with uncleanness of man or beast (ver. 2), or through rash declarations (ver. 4), it was possible inadvertently to transgress the laws of God. **SIN ASSUMES MANY FORMS.** It may be of the voice or the finger, by word or deed. It may be by forcible repression of the truth or by careless voluble utterance. It may be incurred in connection with the noblest or the lowest parts of God's creation. *This thought should beget constant watchfulness* in speaking and acting. We can never be sure of preserving ourselves from contamination with evil. "Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall." The abolition by the gospel of ceremonial restrictions has rather increased than diminished the strictness of the universally obligatory precepts, making them more searching in character. Our Lord taught that there may be adultery in a look, murder in a thought.

II. We find one law applicable to these different cases, one sentence pronounced, one ordinance appointed. **THE IMPORTANT FACT COMMON TO ALL FORMS OF SIN IS THAT THEY INVOLVE THE OFFENDER IN GUILT.** About the particular sin we need not trouble so much as about the fact of transgression and consequent demerit. "He shall bear his iniquity" (ver. 1). "He shall be unclean and guilty" (ver. 2). Jehovah can no longer look upon his subject with favour; sin places him under a cloud, mars him in the sight of God. *Only ignorance can keep a man at ease* under such circumstances. The awakened soul exclaims, "I have sinned: for I have transgressed the commandment of the Lord." The peace of the wicked is like the calm that often precedes the tempest. It is the office of the Word of God to convince the ungodly of their hard speeches and ungodly deeds, and the question the preacher loves to hear is that which shows that the arrow has reached its mark, when the agonized sinner inquires, "What must I do to be saved?"

III. "By the Law is the knowledge of sin," but to leave the matter here would be to subject the transgressor to intolerable anguish. **THERE IS A TWOFOLD METHOD OF EXPIATION,** to restore communion with God. There must be *confession of blameworthiness*. "I have sinned against heaven and before thee." "He shall confess that he hath sinned in that thing" (ver. 5). This acknowledgment by the individual is due to the majesty of God, and is the first step towards obliterating the injury caused by sin. The forces of government have not henceforth to fear assault by the criminal; once arrayed against him in hostile phalanx, they now wear a milder look. The rebel has voluntarily put the yoke of submission upon his neck, and this public token goes far to countervail the damage suffered by the king's honour. And, secondly, there must be *the presentation of an atonement* by the priest. The transgressor is not holy enough to appease offended Deity himself; an unblemished offering is demanded, which must be slaughtered by God's servant and its blood sprinkled upon the altar, and the other rites

of a sin offering duly performed. It is not sufficient to acknowledge and repent of our misdeeds; we want a sin offering, the Lamb of God, so that we can make mention of his righteousness and enjoy the atoning virtue of his precious blood. It is not the offender but the priest who makes atonement (ver. 6). Apart from our great High Priest, our prayers, confessions, vows, and gifts are of no avail. "No man cometh unto the Father but by me."

IV. Either a lamb or a kid, two turtle-doves or pigeons, or a homer of fine flour would be accepted as a propitiatory offering. NO CLASS OF THE COMMUNITY IS DEBARRED FROM AN ATONEMENT BY LACK OF MEANS. Regard is here paid to the resources of the humblest ranks. The same end is attained under the gospel by providing a way of salvation accessible to all, suited to the illiterate and the learned, the men of substance and the poor. And *in each case the forgiveness is complete*. "It shall be forgiven him." The deed done cannot be undone, but its consequences may be averted. God treats the believer as if he had never sinned; his iniquities are cast behind the back of Deity and remembered no more. Fears are banished, fellowship is resumed. With every subsequent transgression the same course must be adopted. Whilst in the world stains are frequent, and frequent must be our resort to the crimson tide that flows from the cross of Christ. What unity of plan and procedure is visible in the Law and the gospel!—S. R. A.

Vers. 1-13.—*The trespass offering.* This was very much of the nature of the sin offering. Julius Bate translates the word (*אַשְׁנָה, asham*) "guilt offering." Possibly the "sin offering" and the "burnt offering" may be here comprehended under the general expression, "trespass offering" (see ver. 7). We have here brought under our notice—

I. EXAMPLES OF THE TRESPASS. Vers. 1-4. Taken in order these are: 1. *Concealing the truth when adjured.* (1) The Hebrew law recognized a power of adjuration. This is assumed in the words "And if a soul sin," etc. (ver. 1). The adjuration in such a case is called the "oath of the Lord" (see Exod. xxii. 11). Paul refers to this law when he says, "An oath for confirmation is the end of all strife" (Heb. vi. 16). (2) The Hebrew history furnishes notable examples of adjuration. Saul, pursuing the Philistines, "adjured the people, saying, Cursed be the man that eateth food until the evening, that I may be avenged on mine enemies" (1 Sam. xiv. 24). Caiaphas said to Jesus, "I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell me whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God" (Matt. xxvi. 63). (3) To conceal the truth when adjured was a crime meriting death. Achan and his family perished in the valley of Achor for his crime in concealing the "accursed thing" (see Josh. vi. 17-19; vii. 11, 23-26). Jonathan, in unwittingly trespassing in the adjuration of Saul, was in danger of losing his life (1 Sam. xiv. 43). 2. *Touching an unclean thing.* (1) The law of the case was that whoever touched any unclean thing, the carcass of an unclean animal, a living person who was leprous or otherwise unclean, or the corpse of a man, became unclean. The purpose was to show how scrupulously we should avoid social contact with those whose influence would be demoralizing (see Jas. iv. 4). (2) Being thus unclean, before he can appear in the sanctuary, he must "wash his clothes, and be unclean until the even," viz. when the daily sacrifice was offered. This shows how we must be purified by the washing of regeneration before we can mingle in the congregation of the heavenly temple. (3) But if a person had inconsiderately entered the sanctuary unclean, not knowing that he was polluted, he has trespassed against the Law, and is guilty. As soon as he becomes aware of his guilt he must bring a trespass offering or bear his sin. 3. *Swearing rashly.* (1) Ver. 4 is somewhat obscure, but this appears to be the meaning: If a man swear to do something without knowing whether it be good or evil, but afterwards it becomes evident that to carry out his oath would be evil; now he is in a dilemma: If he perform his oath he is guilty of doing evil; if he refrain he is guilty of violating his oath. (2) In either case, then, he has to bring a trespass offering with an humble confession of his sin. If he fail in this then his guilt is upon him. The lesson is that we should be slow to swear, lest our oaths should prove rash and involve us in humiliation or ruin.

II. PROVISIONS OF MERCY. 1. *Confession must be made.* (1) Not of sin in general. There is comparatively little humiliation in general confession. Individuality loses

itself in the multitude. (2) But in particular, "that he hath sinned *in this thing*." Sin thus carried home humbles us into the dust. Such was the confession of Achan (Josh. vii. 20), who, though his sin was "unto death," may yet have found the mercy of God to his soul. Such was the confession of David (Ps. li. 4). 2. *It must be accompanied with sacrifice.* (1) "And he shall bring," etc. (ver. 6). Here the "trespass offering" is also called a "sin offering." It is in this case specified to be "a *female* from the flock, a *lamb* or *kid* of the goats." This was the sin offering for any of the common people. The presumption therefore is that for a ruler a *male* kid should be brought for a trespass as for a sin offering; and for a priest, a *bullock* (comp. iv. 23, 28). (2) Confession without atonement will not be accepted. If Achan found acceptance with God in the spirit it must have been immediately through the atonement of Calvary. Atonement without confession will not avail. We have to "work out our own salvation;" meanwhile "God worketh in us both to will and to do." 3. *The poor have special consideration.* (1) Those who may not be able to furnish a lamb may bring either a pair of turtle-doves or a brace of young pigeons. The alternative here appears to be because in certain seasons pigeons in the East are hard and unfit for eating. Turtle-doves are then very good. That must not be given to God which would not be acceptable to man. (2) Two are specified, which are to be thus disposed of: one is offered for a sin offering, the other for a burnt offering; and they are offered in this order. The sin offering goes first to make an atonement; then follows the burnt offering, which is a sacrifice of adoration. Before we can properly praise God we must be at peace with him. (3) Those so very poor as not to be able to bring a brace of pigeons may bring a tenth part of an ephah (about three quarts) of flour. A memorial of this is burnt upon the altar. There must be no oil in the flour to render it tasteful; no frankincense with it to give it fragrance: "it is a sin offering," and sin is distasteful and odious. The remnant is the priest's as a "meat offering."

The interchanging of these offerings, sin and trespass, sin and burnt, sin and meat, shows how they are intended to represent the same great subject under its various aspects. No one typical sacrifice could sufficiently body forth all the merits of that blessed Person who "made his soul a (*or*, *asham*) trespass offering" (Isa. liii. 10).—J. A. M.

Ver. 1.—*Fidelity in bearing witness.* The sinfulness of withholding evidence in a court of law is here formally and solemnly incorporated in the divine statutes. We may remind ourselves—

I. THAT WE SPEND OUR LIFE IN THE SIGHT OF MAN AS WELL AS UNDER THE EYE OF GOD. That we do everything in God's view is a truth the fulness and the greatness of which we cannot exaggerate. "Thou God seest me" should be as a frontlet for every man to wear between the eyes of his soul. But not unimportant is the truth that we act daily and hourly in the sight of man. 1. A very large proportion of our deeds is done obviously and consciously before man. 2. Many that we think are wrought in secret are seen by some unknown witness. 3. Many leave traces which point unmistakably to our agency. "Be sure your sin will find you out." Sooner or later, in unsuspected ways, our evil doings come under the eye of human observation, and under the ban of human condemnation.

II. THAT IT IS OFTEN OUR DUTY TO SCREEN AN OFFENDER FROM PUBLIC NOTICE. This is not in the text, but it belongs to the subject. He who would "do what wrong and sorrow claim" must sometimes "conquer sin and *cover shame*." There are many cases in which public justice does not demand inquiry and reprobation, but private consideration does call for tenderness and mercy (John viii. 7). "Of some have compassion, making a difference" (Jude 22).

III. THAT IT IS OFTEN OUR DUTY TO BEAR WITNESS AGAINST A WRONG-DOER. 1. It is our duty to God, for he has ordained human justice. "The powers that be are ordained of God" (Rom. xiii. 1—4). The Jewish judges had the right to adjure a witness to speak the truth in the name of the Supreme Judge ("hear the voice of swearing;" see 1 Kings viii. 31; Matt. xxvi. 63, 64). If, therefore, under an oath we withhold what we know, we are disregarding a demand that comes indirectly and ultimately from God himself. 2. It is also our duty to society. The commonwealth of which we are members has a right to expect that we shall take our share in the neces-

sary conviction and punishment of crime. When solemnly summoned to state what we know, and especially when an oath of the Lord is upon us, we are not free to keep back evidence, but are bound to disclose it. 3. It may be our duty to the offender himself. For it is better for him that he should bear the penalty due to his crime than that he should elude justice and be encouraged in transgression. 4. It is further our duty to ourselves, for if we are called on to bear witness, and if we undertake, or are even supposed to undertake, to speak all we know, and if then we suppress important testimony, we are consciously misleading those who hear; we are not "doing the truth," but are acting falsely, and are injuring our own soul thereby.

IV. THAT NEGLIGENCE IN SUCH SOCIAL OBLIGATIONS IS A SERIOUS OFFENCE IN THE SIGHT OF GOD. *It is sin.* It is a thing to be repented of and to be forgiven.—C.

Vers. 2, 3.—*Shunning the impure.* We naturally ask, Why such stringent regulations as to everything of man or beast that was "unclean"? We may understand—

I. THE EXPLANATION (THE 'RATIONALE') OF THESE REQUIREMENTS. 1. The two main truths God was teaching his people were the divine unity, and purity of heart and life. The state of surrounding heathendom made these two lessons emphatically and particularly necessary. 2. God's method of teaching was pictorial: it was by rite, symbol, illustration. The world was in its religious childhood. 3. Under this method bodily ills naturally stood for spiritual evils; as wholeness of the body stood for health of the soul, so the sickness of the body answered to the malady of the soul, and the uncleanness of the one to the impurity of the other. 4. Hence would result the fact that the careful avoidance of the one would be an instructive lesson in the shunning of the other. Associating the two things so closely in their minds, commanded to shun most scrupulously all bodily uncleanness, taught to look at the least defilement as a transgression of the law, they would necessarily feel, with all desirable intensity, that every moral and spiritual impurity must be most sensitively avoided. Therefore such enactments as those of the text.

II. THREE MORAL SIGNIFICANCE. They say to us: 1. That we should avoid all that is suggestive of impurity. 2. That we should shun everything which can, in any way or in the least degree, be communicative of spiritual evil. 3. That a stain upon the soul may be contracted without our own knowledge; "if it be hidden from him." This may be through books, friends, habits of speech. 4. That we should point out to the unwary their danger or their error. 5. That on the first intimation of error we should penitently return on our way.—C.

Ver. 4.—*Redeeming promises.* The reference in the text is to inconsiderate oaths: the hasty undertaking, before God, to do some act of piety or kindness on the one hand (swearing "to do good"), or of retribution and permissible punishment on the other (swearing "to do evil"). It is contemplated that such pledges into which the Divine Being is introduced, rashly and thoughtlessly taken, may be overlooked and remain unfulfilled. We learn—

I. THAT THE FORMAL ASSOCIATION OF THE DIVINE BEING WITH ANY ACT LENDS TO IT AN INVIOABLE SACREDNESS. That which is done before God, or with which his holy name is intentionally associated, must be regarded as peculiarly sacred: even if done impulsively and without due deliberation, an obligation is thereby incurred: "God's vows are upon us."

II. THAT IT IS WISE ON ORDINARY OCCASIONS NOT TO INCUR SUCH MULTIPLIED RESPONSIBILITY. Better to use the yea, yea, or nay, nay; the simple affirmation or denial with the lesser obligation than to strengthen our utterance with an oath, and so run the risk of more serious sin in non-fulfilment. Calm, quiet, unimpassioned words are best for daily use. Reserve oaths for large occasions.

III. THAT SUCH RESPONSIBILITY AS WE DO INCUR WE MUST RELIGIOUSLY DISCHARGE. If we only affirm in our own name, but far more if we introduce the Divine name, we must see to it that we redeem our word. Negligence, on whatever grounds, though it be through sheer inadvertence—if "it be hid" from us—is culpable in the sight of God. Wherefore: 1. Study to avoid promising without a due sense of the bond that is entered into. 2. Take the earliest opportunity of redeeming your word, for good or evil. 3. Make an opportunity, if one does not soon offer. 4. Take necessary means of

keeping the promise in remembrance; by natural, or (if necessary) by artificial means. We may infer—

**IV. THAT IF SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITY ATTACHES TO A PROMISE WITH WHICH GOD'S NAME IS ASSOCIATED, SO DOES IT TO ONE IN CONNECTION WITH HIS CAUSE.** If we cannot vow, before him, to do any humblest thing without incurring added liability, neither can we undertake to serve in the affairs of his kingdom without similar obligation. A promise made to take any post or fill any office in the Church of Christ should be regarded as exceptionally sacred and binding; neglect by inadvertence is wrong, *sinful*. We are bound to keep before our mind and on our heart anything with which God's name and cause are immediately connected.—C.

**Vers. 5-13.—*Pardon possible to all.*** The requirements of the Law, as stated in these verses, speak of the possibility of pardon for every offender, if he be willing to submit himself to the will of God. We have—

**I. CONFESSION OF SIN.** “He shall confess that he hath sinned” (ver. 5). It is believed that confession was always required from the offerer when he laid his hand on the victim's head. It was a marked feature in the ceremonies of the Day of Atonement; it is expressly enjoined here. This was not only necessary from all, but possible to all; within every one's power: none would be unable, and none would be unwilling, but the impenitent who were unprepared for pardon.

**II. AN OFFERING WHICH EVERY ONE COULD PRESENT.** He that could do so was to bring a lamb or kid (ver. 6); he that could not might bring “two turtle-doves, or two young pigeons” (ver. 7); if this were beyond his means, he might bring a portion of “fine flour” (ver. 11). The costliness of the offering was thus graciously graduated to the circumstances of the offerer. And of so much importance did it appear to the Divine Legislator that the sacrifice should be within the reach of all, that he allowed a deviation from the otherwise unalterable rule that there must be the shedding of blood for the remission of sins (ch. xvii. 11; Heb. ix. 22). The very poor might bring flour (ver. 11), though, in order that there might be no mistake as to the import of it, it was specially prohibited to mix oil or frankincense with it (ver. 11).

**III. A PLACE OF APPROACH OPEN TO ALL.** The transgressor, convinced of his error, was to take his offering “unto the Lord,” by taking it “to the priest.” The priest at the door of the tabernacle was always approachable; never a day when he might not be found.

**IV. INSTRUCTIONS THAT ALL COULD UNDERSTAND.** There could be no doubt or difficulty as to what precise things were to be done. What offering should be presented, whether it should be taken, what should be done with it,—all this was so explicitly and clearly laid down in the Law (vers. 6-12), that every Israelite who had the burden of conscious sin upon his soul, knew what he should do that the guilt might be removed, and that he himself might stand clear and pure in the sight of God.

In the gospel of Christ we have analogous but fuller advantages. We have—

1. *Confession of sin.* We must all say, as we all can say, “Father, I have sinned” (Luke xv. 21). (See Rom. x. 10; John i. 9.)

2. *One Offering that all can plead.* No need of lamb, or goat, or turtle-dove, or even the humble measure of flour. The rich and the poor of the land may say, “Nothing in my hand I bring;” for they have but to plead the one Great and All-sufficient Sacrifice that has been presented, once for all (Rom. vi. 10; Heb. ix. 28; 1 Pet. iii. 18), and they will find mercy of the Lord. The richest can do no more; the poorest need do no less.

3. *An open throne of grace.* “In Christ Jesus our Lord we have boldness and access with confidence” (Eph. iii. 11, 12). No day nor hour when the way to the mercy-seat is barred; from every home and chamber the sin-laden, struggling soul finds its way thither: one earnest thought, and it is there!

4. *Familiar knowledge of the will of God.* Every unlettered man and untutored child may know what is “the will of God in Christ Jesus concerning us.” Our statute-book, our New Testament, makes it clear as the day that, if we would find forgiveness of our sin, we must not only confess our transgression, but have faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and by faith we shall be saved.—C.

Vers. 1—13.—*Cases of concealment of knowledge and ceremonial uncleanness.* They are in some sense trespasses, although not properly under the head of trespass offerings. The ground of guilt is *covenant relation violated*. We may take this in its twofold aspect—

I. As revealing THE POSITIVE VALUE OF THAT COVENANT RELATION. 1. It separated from the unclean, and therefore enforced holiness. 2. It maintained society. Man's duty to his fellows was exalted. He must speak the truth, the whole truth, nothing but the truth; for we are members one of another. 3. It promoted vigilance and circumspection in conduct, both personal and relative. See that you are pure both in your intentional acts and in your circumstances; walk in wisdom towards them that are without.

II. The offering provided and the atonement possible in all cases, even the most minute, plainly said, GOD WILL ABUNDANTLY PARDON; HIS LAW IS LIBERTY." The covenant was not intended to be bondage; it was salvation, not destruction. If any man sin, there is forgiveness. But this waited to be gloriously illustrated when the perfect fulfilment of the Law was set forth in him who offered himself without spot, "able to save unto the uttermost all who come unto God through him."—R.

### EXPOSITION.

THE TRESPASS OFFERING (ch. v. 14—19, vi. 1—7). The new heading with which ver. 14 begins indicates that it is here and not at ver. 1 that the section on trespass offerings commences. Sin offerings and trespass offerings are not distinguished from each other in Ps. xl. 6; Heb. x. 8; and the classification of the sins which require one or the other offering has caused great perplexity to commentators. It would appear that, primarily, the trespass offering was reserved for those cases in which reparation had to be made. Thus, if a man failed to pay his tithes and offerings to the Lord (ver. 14), he must bring his trespass offering; or if he refused to restore a deposit to his neighbours (ch. vi. 2), he must bring his trespass offering; and his trespass offering is not received until he has made satisfaction to the party wronged, and paid, as a fine, one-fifth of the value of the thing that he had appropriated. But the class of crimes for which the trespass offering was required came to be enlarged by the addition of other cases, similar in character to the first, but not identical, whereby wrong was done to the Lord (as by transgressing his commands otherwise than by withholding tithes and offerings, ver. 17), or to man (as by wronging a female slave, ch. xix. 20, where the wrong is not estimated by money). These cases are distinguished with difficulty from those for which a sin offering is required. The same act might render it incumbent on a

man to offer either a sin offering or a trespass offering, or both: the sin offering would teach the need of, and would symbolically effect, expiation for sin; the trespass offering would teach the necessity of, and would require at the offerer's hands, reparation for wrong. While the sin offering typified the expiation wrought upon the cross, the trespass offering typified the satisfaction for sin effected by the perfect life and voluntary death of the Saviour.

Vers. 14, 15.—*If a soul commit a trespass.* Two previous conditions were required of the Israelite before he might offer his trespass offering. 1. He must make compensation for any harm or injury that he had done. 2. He must give to the injured party a fine equal to one-fifth (i.e. two-tenths) of the value of the thing of which he had deprived him, if the wrong was capable of being so estimated. In performing his sacrifice, he had (1) to bring a ram to the court of the tabernacle; (2) to present and to kill it: while the priest (1) cast the blood on the inner sides of the altar; (2) burnt the internal fat and the tail; (3) took the remainder to be eaten by himself and his brother priests and their sons in the court of the tabernacle (ch. vii. 2—7). The special lesson of the trespass offering is the need of satisfaction as well as of oblation, and thus it supplies a representation of one feature in the great Antitype, who was the "full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world." Through ignorance (see note on ch. iv. 2).

Vers. 15, 16 refer to sins of omission,

offences in the holy things of the Lord; that is, withholding tithes and offerings. The non-payment of tithes and offerings was looked upon as robbing Jehovah (Mal. iii. 8), and therefore it is that a trespass offering, involving compensation, and not only a sin offering, is required to atone for the offence. The ram that is to be offered is to be of a value fixed by the priest (with thy estimation, i.e. according to the estimation of the priest), and the priest is to estimate it by shekels of silver; implying that its value must amount at least to *shekels* (in the plural), meaning two shekels (see Ezek. xlvi. 13, where "portions" means "more than one portion," i.e. "two portions"). The shekel is considered to be equal to 2s. 7d. The shekel of the *sanctuary* means the shekel according to its exact weight and value,

while still unworn by traffic and daily use. Beside offering the ram, he is to make amends for the harm (or rather *sin*) that he hath done in the *holy thing*, and . . . add the fifth part. The fifth part is probably appointed as being the same as two-tenths of the principal sum. Full satisfaction is the marked feature of the trespass offering. In Luke xix. 8, "Zacchæus stood, and said, . . . Behold, Lord, . . . if I have taken anything from any man by false accusation, I restore fourfold." He went far beyond his legal obligation in respect to compensation. (Cf. 2 Sam. xii. 6, "He shall restore the lamb fourfold.")

Vers. 17—19. Sins of commission may be atoned for by the trespass offering as well as sins of omission.

#### HOMILETICS.

Vers. 14—19.—*The trespass offering* differs from the sin offering in that it was not allowed to be presented until reparation had been made for the evil done by him who desired to offer it. Its special lesson to the Israelite was that satisfaction for sin is necessary for restoration to communion as well as sacrifice.

ITS TYPICAL LESSON. Satisfaction implies that there is a debt due which must be paid. The debt is due to God; the debtor is man. Christ took upon himself the payment of the debt, which man could not pay. He paid it in two ways: 1. By bearing the punishment due for its non-payment by man. 2. By rendering in his own person that perfect obedience which man had failed to render, and by that failure had become a helpless debtor. Having compensated for man's disobedience by the perfect obedience of his life, he bore the punishment still due for that previous disobedience by the sacrifice of his death. Thus man's forgiveness became not only a matter of mercy on God's part, but of his justice. (See St. Anselm's 'Cur Deus Homo?' and Archbishop Thomson's 'Essay on the Death of Christ' in 'Aids to Faith'.)

#### HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

*Restitution as inculcated in the trespass offering.* Ch. v. 14—vi. 7; comp. Phil. iv. 8, 9; Luke xix. 8; Matt. v. 23, 24. The trespass offering, in emphasizing the idea of *restitution*, is needful to complete the list of sacrifices. Without the just dealing this sacrifice demands, the personal consecration, fellowship, and atonement would savour of what was unreal and vain. God's mercy secures morality, and his Word condemns every desire to enjoy his grace and the fruits of injustice at the same time. Let us, then, notice—

I. THE POSSIBILITY OF WRONGING BOTH GOD AND MAN UNINTENTIONALLY. This passage presents this possibility. An Israelite might miscalculate the amount of his offerings, and find, on examination, that he has defrauded his God. This omission must be made good. Or again, he might commit, through want of thought, something God had forbidden, and for this sin of commission he must make restitution according to the estimation of the priest. The possibility of wronging a fellow-man unintentionally is too obvious to require illustration.

Of the first wrong we have, in these gospel times, an instance in *defective liberality* on the part of Christians. How many fail to calculate how much they owe to God! *Systematic beneficence* is a general principle, but it is applied only in the rough, and a faithful analysis will generally prove that God has been defrauded. We defraud God also in the matter of *time* and of *work*. We grudge him his own day; we give him stinted service. A quite appreciable defalcation under such heads as these might be made out against most of us.

Again, unintentional wrong is often done a neighbour in, for example, an *unexpected failure* in business. There are many, let us believe, who reach bankruptcy without intending it. They erred with the very best intentions, and through faulty management allowed their affairs to become hopelessly involved. But the loss suffered by a man's neighbours is not the less real because of his good intentions. Nor will these good intentions pass as good bills with the wronged neighbour's creditors.

II. LET US NOTICE THE POSSIBILITY OF DELIBERATELY WRONGING OUR NEIGHBOUR. We have intentional trespass against man brought out in the opening verses of the sixth chapter. We have here such sins contemplated as falsity in trust, robbery, oppression, and tergiversation about property which has been found. Here the intention as well as the act is at fault.

Our present *mercantile immoralities* afford ample illustrations. In fact, business qualities are regarded by many as consisting in the advantage which a man is able, legally, to take of his neighbour. Men, without sufficient courage to become highway robbers, can take advantage of a neighbour behind the hedge of some blundering act of parliament.

III. THE LAW OF MOSES DEMANDED RESTITUTION IN ALL THESE CASES AS A CONDITION OF PARDON. Unless the trespassers brought the amount of the defalcation, with a double tithe in addition, and the prescribed ram for a trespass offering, God refused them pardon and fellowship.

The case of Zacchaeus is in point. His interview with Jesus led to the desire of restitution arising naturally in his heart. "If I have taken anything from any man by false accusation, I restore him fourfold" (Luke xix. 8). God's forgiveness is not independent of moral feeling. God will not forgive trespass so as to encourage the continuance of injustice. There must be restitution and compensation, or he will not grant pardon.

IV. AT THE SAME TIME, THAT RESTITUTION SHOULD NOT BE REGARDED AS MERITORIOUS, THE LAW REQUIRED A TRESPASS OFFERING IN ADDITION. There have been cases of restitution by bankrupts and other trespassers, but they are so blazed abroad in the newspapers, that the public is ready to set them down as meritorious, and almost supererogations. But the Divine Law excluded all possibility of boasting, by attaching a trespass offering to the restitution. A ram must be brought; confession of sin must be made over it in the usual fashion; it must be slain; its blood must be sprinkled as in the former cases; the choice portions are dedicated to God on his altar; and the remainder eaten by the priests.

All this was to show that, even for such an act as restitution, atonement was needful. It could not stand alone; it had no inherent merit; it was only tardy justice; and for the wrong there is need of atonement as well as reparation. And surely the same great truth meets us in the Christian life. Jesus as the Trespass Offering—and this is the phraseology employed in Isa. liii. 10 regarding him—must encircle us with his merits, even when we are conscientiously making restitution. It is as *penitents* we should do this. Even though the world glories in the reparation of wrong as something in its view most meritorious, the persons making reparation should do so in a penitent spirit, having regard always to the atoning merits of the Saviour.

V. THE COURAGE NECESSARY TO MAKE RESTITUTION MUST BE SUSTAINED BY THE FEARLESS PROCLAMATION OF GOD'S LAW. A certain *antinomianism* is encouraged, if not proclaimed, by a loose presentation of God's gospel. Immoralities are tolerated in commerce on the part of professing Christians, that go far to defeat the mission of Christianity. It is essential, in these circumstances, that we should cultivate the courage of men, and sustain their resolutions to be honest and just in making all possible restitution. God requires no less honesty in his gospel than he did in his Law. He never meant his pardon to be enjoyed along with the fruits of wrong-doing. These must be surrendered if it is to be enjoyed. "If it is absolutely impossible to be saved by the works of the Law, it is not less impossible to be saved without the works of *faith*, for *faith* without *works* is no *faith* at all." We must consequently think on "whatsoever things are honest" (Phil. iv. 8), and remember our Saviour's words, "If thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath ought against thee; leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift" (Matt. v. 23, 24).—R. M. E.

Vers. 14—16.—*Trespass amended.* I. To WITHHOLD FROM GOD HIM DUES IS SINFUL. The rigour of Leviticus may well sharpen that perception of sin which is so apt to become dim. God is wealthy, and yet will not submit tamely to robbery. Minute instructions were given concerning the offering of tithes, etc., for the use of his servants at the tabernacle, and for his glory; and to omit such offerings and to employ them in profane uses is here counted as acting covertly, as faithless dealing. For it was a condition of the covenant that the people should purchase their exemption from entire devotedness, by recognizing that it was incumbent on them to support those engaged wholly in God's service; and to neglect this condition was, in truth, a breach of trust. It is not less needful to-day that Christians should contribute of their substance to the carrying on of the work of the Church. Nor is it less important to call attention to the trespass committed by failing to present to God the emotion he claims. Many imagine that they are comparatively faultless if they abstain from open notorious wickedness, and they overlook their fatal omissions in the matter of religious service, affection, and faith. “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart,” etc. “Trust ye in the Lord for ever.” Not to confess Christ is considered as denying him. Besides, it is in the passage before us assumed that the property which ought to have been devoted to the Lord has been consumed for personal enjoyment. And similarly, we may argue that the love and time and strength not used as required for God, are lavished upon other objects, and a wrong is done to our Father in heaven.

II. TO COMMIT A TRESPASS UNINTENTIONALLY DOES NOT PREVENT THE NECESSITY OF AN ATONEMENT. This is a lesson frequently enforced in the Law. “Though he wist it not, yet is he guilty, and shall bear his iniquity” (ver. 17). Evidences of the same Divine Law are visible in the consequences that follow mistakes in life, where accidental errors, wrong judgments, hasty steps, are productive of as injurious effects as if the word or action had been planned with utmost deliberation, and its result foreseen. Any other arrangement might augment men's carelessness, and prove in the end more harmful than the apparently inequitable law. We are taught the infinite importance that attaches to our actions, linked on as they are with a chain of invariable results. To sin is to run counter to widespread principles; it is not a little matter that may be contemned; it makes a breach in the fortress of right and justice, and this breach must be repaired ere the offender can be regarded as on the side of the eternal verities. “The soul that sinneth, it shall die.” If not the transgressor, then an unblemished ram must be slaughtered as his substitute, that blood may cleanse the stain, and cover the transgressor from wrath. How easy is the way made under the gospel, whereby, after the sin offering of Christ, all our sins are forgiven us for his name's sake!

III. ACQUAINTANCE WITH THE WRONG DONE MUST BE FOLLOWED BY AN ENDEAVOUR TO AMEND IT. The high priest is to value the “harm,” and a fifth being added to the amount, the priest receives it as compensation. The offender has gained nothing by his sin. Sin never profits in the end. The restitution is thorough. We may reasonably distrust the sincerity of a repentance that is unaccompanied by reformation. When conscience money is brought, then the confession and desire of the offender to undo the evil wrought, as far as possible, are patent. The atonement and the restitution together procure the forgiveness of the suppliant. What avail it that men have learnt their “trespass,” unless it lead to amendment? Knowledge is designed to be the forerunner of action. Like electricity, it furnishes light and moving power.—S. R. A.

Vers. 14—19.—*Trespass in sacrilege.* The verses now under consideration form a distinct matter of revelation, or were communicated to Moses at a separate time. This we infer from the opening words, “And the Lord spake unto Moses,” comparing them with like expressions twice used already (see ch. I. 1; iv. 1).

I. WILFUL SACRILEGE WAS PUNISHABLE WITH DEATH. 1. *It is fraud “in the holy things of the Lord.”* (1) These are such things as belong to him by requirement of his Law or by solemn dedication. Thus he claims half a shekel per head ransom money when the people are numbered (Exod. xxx. 11—16). He claims the firstborn or a redemption for it (Exod. xxxiv. 11, 20; Numb. xviii. 16). He claims the firstfruits of the harvest (ch. xxiii. 10—14; Prov. iii. 9). He claims tithes (ch. xxvii. 30—32).

The treasures of the temple of whatever kind were also holy things. (2) To withhold any of these dues, or to profane by eating that which belonged to the priests, was a sacrilege, and, if wittingly done, exposed the criminal to death (see Lev. xxii. 14—16; comp. ver. 9). 2. *This was the crime of Achan.* (1) Joshua's adjuration devoted all the spoils taken at Jericho to the Lord (Josh. vi. 17—19). Achan, therefore, not only incurred the curse of the adjuration, but was also guilty of sacrilege. He is, therefore, said to have "transgressed the covenant of the Lord" (Josh. vii. 11, 15). (2) His punishment was consequently signal. For his sake the children of Israel were smitten before the men of Ai, and the anger of the Lord was only averted from the nation by their stoning and burning Achan, his family, and all pertaining to him (Josh. vii. 24—26). 3. *This also was the crime of Ananias and Sapphira.* (1) Under the glorious influences of the Holy Spirit at the Pentecost, the Church agreed to have all things in common, to which Ananias and Sapphira were consenting parties. They accordingly sold a possession which had been thus devoted to God, but secretly reserved part of the price, placing the balance only at the apostles' feet. (2) This crime was miraculously punished with death. The punishment evinced that the spirit of the Law is still in the gospel. Query: How does this bear upon those who have vowed that a proportion of their revenue should be sacred to God, but with increasing prosperity have become worldly, and withdrew the hand (see Mal. iii. 8—12)?

II. SACRILEGE THROUGH INADVERTENCY ADMITS OF REPARATION. 1. *In cases that are undoubted.* (1) This class of cases is described ver. 15: "If a soul commit a trespass, and sin through ignorance, in the holy things of the Lord," etc. He knows what he did, though ignorant that it was sacrilege, but is now better informed. (2) His duty now is clear: "He shall bring for his trespass unto the Lord a ram without blemish out of the flocks." He brings a *male*, probably in recognition that his sin was an interference with things concerning *rulers* ecclesiastical. "With thy estimation by shekels of silver, after the shekel of the sanctuary, for a trespass offering." (3) But how are we to understand this? It may mean that payment may be made in money or silver, according to the estimated value of the harm sustained by the trespass. Some read, "by thy estimation *two* shekels of silver," etc., which would be a restoring four-fold, half a shekel being the atonement money. This is given to the temple (see Exod. xxx. 13). "And he shall add to it a fifth, and give it to the priest." With this he is accepted. 2. *In cases that are doubtful.* (1) These are described ver. 17: "And if a soul sin, and commit any of these things which are forbidden to be done by the commandments of the Lord; *though he wist it not, yet*," etc. He suspects that he may have trespassed in sacrilege, but is not sure; "Yet is he guilty." The very doubt makes him guilty. (2) This principle is recognized in the precepts of the New Testament. Paul doubtless deduced from this Law his declarations, that "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin," and that "He that doubts is damned," or condemned. (3) This person also must bring a ram with his estimation for the hypothetical harm; but in this case there is no addition of the fifth. Learn that ignorance is a crime, as it leads to transgression: therefore study God's Law. Cultivate a tender conscience.—J. A. M.

Vers. 15, 16.—*Restitution to God.* The trespass for which "God spake unto Moses" that the children of Israel should make atonement, was an offence in which there was present the element of reparable wrong-doing. Something, it was contemplated, would be done which could be in some respects made good, and where this was possible it was to be done. In most cases this would refer to wrong done to man; but here we have the truth that God may be wronged, and that he condescends to receive restitution at our hands. We may look at—

I. SIN REGARDED AS A DEBT WHICH IS DUE TO GOD. Jehovah was sovereign Lord of the Hebrew commonwealth, and actual proprietor of all; anything withheld from those who were his ministers was a sacred due withheld, a debt undischarged. Our God is he: 1. Who has placed us under immeasurable obligation—by creation, preservation, benefaction, fatherly love, Divine interposition. 2. To whom we owe everything we are and have—our hearts and lives. 3. From whom we have withheld that which we shall never be able to pay: our reverence, gratitude, obedience, submission; "ten thousand talents" (Matt. xviii. 24). But there are some special defaults:—

II. ARREARS IN HOLY THINGS. "If a soul commit a trespass . . . in the holy things of

the Lord" (ver. 15). The Israelites were under many injunctions; they probably received professional instruction from the Levites, as well as religious teaching at home (Deut. vi. 7). But they might be betrayed into ignorance or fall into forgetfulness, and they might come short of their duty (1) in the offerings they were to bring to the altar, (2) in the contributions they were to make to the ministers of God. They might ignorantly rob God in offerings and in tithes, as they even did *intentionally* (Mal. iii. 8). We also may fall far short of what we should bring to God; we may take a totally inadequate view (1) of the nature of the worship we should render, (2) of the frequency of our devotional engagements, (3) of the contribution we should give to the support of the Christian ministry, (4) of our due share in the maintenance of the cause and the extension of the kingdom of Christ. Thus we may ignorantly but guiltily (ver. 17) fall short of our sacred obligations.

**III. THE ATONEMENT WHICH MUST BE FIRST PRESENTED.** First of all, there was the offering "not without blood" to be made: the ram must be brought by the offender, and "the priest shall make an atonement for him with the ram, . . . and it shall be forgiven him." First, we must plead the atoning blood of the slain lamb, seeking and finding forgiveness through the Saviour's sacrifice. But this is not all; there is—

**IV. THE RESTITUTION WHICH SHOULD SUBSEQUENTLY BE MADE.** The Jew was required to "make amends for the harm he had done in the holy things," and not only to give an equivalent to that which he had withheld, but to "add the fifth part thereto;" he was not only to make up, but do more than make up for his default. We cannot and we need not attempt to act according to the letter of this injunction, but we may and should act in the spirit of it, by *letting our consciousness of past deficiency in the worship and the service of Christ incite us to multiplied endeavours in the future*. In looking back we recall negligences to attend the sanctuary, to come to the table of the Lord, to worship God in the secret chamber of devotion; therefore let us seek his face and his favour with constancy and earnestness in the days to come. We have not served his cause and our generation according to the measure of his bountiful dealings with us; therefore let us open our hand freely, and give far more generously than we should otherwise have done to those various agencies of beneficence which are turning the wilderness of wrong into the garden of the Lord.—C.

Ver. 17.—*Unconscious sin.* Is there not something here contrary to our generally received ideas respecting sin? *Can a man sin "though he wist it not"?* The text suggests—

**I. THAT WE COMMONLY CONNECT WITH OUR IDEA OF SIN THE CONSCIOUSNESS OF GUILT AT THE TIME OF TRANSGRESSION.** Sin is only possible to intelligent, responsible beings; it implies the power of discernment; it is usually followed by self-reproach; it seems, at first sight, to involve a consciousness in the soul of error and wrong-doing at the moment of commission. Hence men expect to be excused if they can say they did not know it was wrong at the time, etc.

**II. THAT THIS THOUGHT ABOUT SIN IS BASED ON TRUTH.** It is true: 1. That sin is a wilful departure from rectitude: it is the soul consenting to commit some one of "those things which are forbidden to be done by the commandments of the Lord." Where the will does not consent, there is no moral character in the act at all. 2. That the less there is of knowledge, the less there is of guilt (Luko xii. 48). 3. That in the absence of all possible knowledge, there is entire freedom from guilt. "Where no law is, there is no transgression" (Rom. iv. 15). Scripture confirms what our reason declares, that there can be no condemnation where there are no means of knowing "the commandments of the Lord." But we are bound to remember for ourselves, and to impress on others, the opposite aspect, viz.—

**III. THAT THIS TRUTH IS SUBJECT TO VERY GRAVE QUALIFICATIONS.** 1. Attainable knowledge not gained involves sin. The Jews ought to have known that it was obligatory on them, and highly beneficial to them, to be loyal to Jehovah, to be obedient to his servant Moses, to receive the exhortations of the prophets; their ignorance was culpable, and therefore their errors were sinful. So with their non-recognition of Jesus Christ. So with our ignorance of that which is most binding on us and most beneficial to us. We ought to know that the service of Christ is the chief duty and the supreme blessing; in our ignorance is our guilt. 2. Needless for-

getfulness is sin. It was criminal on the part of the Jews of the prophetic age to forget the merciful and mighty interpositions of God in earlier days; on the part of those of our Lord's day to forget the mighty works by which he proved himself to be the very Son of God. It is criminal on our part to forget those vital truths of which God's Word reminds us. 3. The blunting of our spiritual perceptions is sin. When we are blind to the truth which is before us, because our prejudice, or our pride, or our passion, or our worldly interests distort our vision, or because long continuance in folly has blunted our spiritual powers, we are guilty: we "know not what we do," even when we are crucifying a Messiah; but the guilt in the action lies chiefly in the existence of these enfeebled or perverted faculties, and, though we "wist not," yet we "are guilty" in the sight of God.

IV. THAT UNCONSCIOUS SIN CARRIES ITS PENALTY WITH IT. "He shall bear his iniquity." The penalty is threefold: 1. The displeasure of God—his condemnation. 2. Serious harm done to our own soul. 3. Awaking, soon, to the conviction that we have done grievous wrong to others,—it may be a reparable, but it may be an irreparable, wrong.—C.

Vers. 14—ch. vi. 7.—*The trespass offerings.* Distinguished as: 1. Being violations of *rights of property*, either religious or non-religious property. 2. Including a *fine*, apportioned by the priest, for restoration. 3. *Without distinction of persons or circumstances*. 4. The victim, a *ram without blemish* from the flocks, and the *atonement* both *sacred* as producing *Divine forgiveness*, and *secular* as including *pecuniary indemnity*; the blood being in this case merely swung against the side of the altar, not smeared on the horns.

Ver. 17.—*The unwitting trespass.* "Though he wist it not, yet is he guilty, and shall bear his iniquity."

I. THE ABSOLUTE PERFECTION OF THE DIVINE LAW. It must be maintained: 1. As a revelation of the character of God. 2. As a basis on which the moral law is placed. 3. As a means of convincing man of sin, separating the idea of guilt from arbitrary, capricious, local, individual, emotional respects.

II. THE INFINITE FULNESS OF THE DIVINE COMPASSION. 1. *Atonement is provided* not only for sins repented of and confessed, but for offences unwittingly committed. God is thus represented as the shield of his creature, amid the working out of his inscrutable will in the universe. 2. The mind obtains *wonderful peace* when it is assured that all possible liabilities are foreseen and averted. 3. *Forgiveness* is not a mere doing away of sin in the conscience, but a removal of the burden from the life. The Law has nothing more against us.—R.

## EXPOSITION.

### CHAPTER VI.

THE TRESPASS OFFERING—continued (vers. 1—7). The next seven verses, which in the Hebrew arrangement form the conclusion of the previous chapter, enumerate cases of fraud and wrong, for which a trespass offering is required. They are moral, not ceremonial offences. Reparation and the payment of a fine are demanded before the offering is made.

Ver. 1.—And the Lord spake. The six following verses contain a separate communication from the Lord to Moses, but in continuance of the subject which began at ch. v. 14.

Ver. 2.—This verse would be better translated as follows:—If a soul sin, and commit a

trespass against the Lord, and falsely deny to his neighbour something that was delivered to him to keep, or something that he had received in pawn, or something that he had taken away by violence, or hath got something by oppression from his neighbour. Cf. the injunction in ch. xix. 11: "Ye shall not steal, neither deal falsely, neither lie one to another." Exod. xxii. 7—13 contains earlier legislation on the subject of things taken in trust.

Ver. 3.—Or have found that which was lost. Cf. Deut. xxii. 2, 3, "Thou shalt bring it unto thine own house, and it shall be with thee until thy brother seek after it, and thou shalt restore it to him again. In like manner shalt thou do with his ass; and so shalt thou do with his raiment; and with all lost thing of thy brother's, which he hath lost, and thou hast found, shalt thou

do likewise." *And sweareth falsely.* By previous legislation it had been appointed that, in case of a doubt arising as to what had become of property delivered to another to keep, there should be "an oath of the Lord between them both, that" the latter "hath not put his hand unto his neighbour's goods; and the owner of it shall accept thereof, and he shall not make it good" (Exod. xxii. 11). This opened the way to false swearing where men were dishonest. Sinning therein. Wrong to man is sin against God in every case, but a special sin against

God is committed when an appeal has been made to him by oath, and the oath has been false.

Ver. 4.—As before, the profit gained by fraud or violence is to be given up, and with it a fine is to be paid, amounting to one-fifth of the value of the thing appropriated.

Ver. 5.—In the day of his trespass offering is a better rendering than that of the margin, "in the day of his being found guilty," or "in the day of his trespass." The reparation is to take place, and immediately afterwards the offering is accepted.

### HOMILETICS.

Ver. 3.—*Swearing falsely* is in an especial manner a sin against God, because in an oath an appeal is directly made to God, and if the thing sworn to is false, God is called to witness to a thing as true which the swearer knows to be false. It is also in an especial manner a sin against society, as mutual truth-telling is the very bond of social trust. When the moral and religious tone of a nation stands high, "an oath for confirmation is the end of all strife" (Heb. vi. 16), and on the other hand, when either a disbelief in God's providence or a casuistical theology saps the confidence placed in promises confirmed by oaths, society is perilously near its dissolution (see Bishop Sanderson's 'Obligation of Oaths'). The sanctity of an oath is guarded by a special commandment in the Decalogue.

Ver. 5.—*Repentance, confession, satisfaction, absolution*, follow each other in order. Without repentance confession is vain; without confession satisfaction is impracticable; without satisfaction there is no absolution. In the present case, the sense of absolution was conveyed to the soul of the sinner by the acceptance of his offering for trespass, after which he ceased to be, what he was before, virtually excommunicate from God's people. The greater moral offences were punished either by death (Exod. xi. 12-17; xxxi. 15; xxxii. 27; ch. xx. 9-16; xxiv. 23; Numb. xxv. 5; Deut. xiii. 9; xix. 11; Josh. vii. 25), or by formal excommunication, when the offenders were cut off from the people of the Lord, though their lives were spared (ch. vii. 20, 21; Gen. xvii. 14). But there was, and there is, an excommunication, not formally pronounced, when a man feels that his sin has separated between him and his God. In these cases the sin offering or the trespass offering restored to communion, but they might not be offered, that is, absolution might not be effected by them, unless preceded by repentance and confession, and, where the nature of the case admitted of it, by satisfaction for the wrong done.

### HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

Vers. 1-7.—*Dishonesty atoned for.* The rebukes tacitly administered by the Law in cases of unjust dealing are neither effete nor unnecessary in modern days. The practices here reprehended still survive, commercial immorality is even yet a fruitful topic of remark. Temptations to dishonesty abound, and are as potent as of yore, for the springs of evil in the human breast remain unaltered, pouring forth their dark and bitter waters. And whilst it is not by works that the children of God expect to be justified, yet may their good works glorify God; and to guard against the deeds of injustice to which men are prone is to adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour. Happy the congregation of Christians none of whose members has ever been convicted of the transgressions mentioned in these verses!

I. THE SIN DESCRIBED. 1. *Its main feature is the unlawful possession of another's property*, through wrongful acquisition or detention. Force or deceit has been employed in procuring or retaining the goods. This sin may be committed in little things or great, and by communities as well as individuals. 2. *Its source is avarice.* The eye beholds, the heart covets, the will consents, and the hand grasps, as in the history of

Achan, who robbed God (Josh. vii. 21). There is thus the evil co-operation of the senses and faculties, sin in inward thought and outward act. The temporary gratification of the flesh is preferred to the durable contentment of the spirit; self is brought into hideous prominence, as if it could never be coincident with the interest of others and of God. It is classed with sins of ignorance because, though wittingly done, the covetous desire seems to blind the moral sight, and man acts as if under the constraint of a foreign power. Beware of greed! it is insidious in its approaches, and awful in its effects. 3. *It is aggravated by falsehood.* One sin drags another in its wake; avarice prepares the way for lying, even demands it that its designs may be achieved. What has been taken by force is often defended by perjury. The pillars of wickedness are unstable; they need each other's support, for they cannot stand alone in their own native strength. A covetous heart calls for a deceitful tongue.

II. THE REPARATION. Real happiness does not accompany sin; it is a thorny rose, a cup with nauseous elements, a nightmare sleep. Though no human eye detect the wrong, the sinner is guilty, and knows that One above will not recognize the right of might and violence, nor allow his name to be used with impunity as a shield to vice. Remorse tortures the transgressor, until he is driven to confess his crime and to make amends for it. The Law mercifully appoints a salve for the bleeding conscience. 1. *Full restitution to the rightful owner.* The property stolen or retained, together with an added fifth, is returned as compensation for the injury suffered. Sin is shown to be unprofitable, and no length of possession is allowed to supply a reason for inequitable retention. Lapse of time must never be supposed to bar recovery of rights. Are there no persons in our assemblies to whom this law is applicable? 2. *Acknowledgment of an offence committed against God.* It was "a trespass against the Lord" (ver 2), and in several respects. His commandments were broken, notably the second, third, eighth, and tenth (Exod. xx.). An atonement is required, the sacrifice of a ram, the fat parts of which are burnt on the altar, and the rest eaten by the priests. The two branches of the moral law are closely connected. To violate the one is to dishonour the other. Experience attests their contiguity. Those who best regard the interests of their neighbours are the men that are jealous for the honour of God. Forget not to impress upon children the importance of asking, not only their parents' pardon, but the forgiveness of their heavenly Father when they have acted dishonestly or unkindly. Frequently the newspapers record the receipt by the Chancellor of the Exchequer of money sent because of unpaid taxes. Do the senders always remember that they have sinned against God as well as man; and implore forgiveness in the name of Jesus Christ?—S. R. A.

Vers. 1—7.—*Restitution.* This paragraph ought to have been included in the preceding chapter, as it is the conclusion of the subject there considered. The last paragraphs treated of sacrilege, or trespass in the holy things of God; this has reference to trespass between man and man. We have here—

I. AN ENUMERATION OF WRONGS. These may be distributed into two classes, viz.: 1. *In matters of fraud.* These may be (1) in respect to things in custody, "that which was delivered him to keep." Under this heading may be ranged things left in pledge, the possession of which is afterwards denied. Also things borrowed and fraudulently retained. (2) In respect to "fellowship." This may refer, in matters of partnership, to claiming for sole interest profits that should be divided, or shifting liabilities which should be jointly borne wholly to the partner's account. The Hebrew here is "putting of the hand," which the margin interprets "in dealing." Any fraud in trade would, therefore, come under this head, viz. by light weight, short measure, false balances, false samples, adulterations, misrepresentation of values, or saunterings by which an employer is robbed of his time. (3) In respect to trusts. Executors so managing estates as to enrich themselves at the expense of their wards. Public servants manipulating accounts to pocket balances, or taking bribes to favour particular contractors to the prejudice of competitors or of the public. (4) In respect to "the lost thing which he found." Solon's law was, "Take not up that which you laid not down." Historians relate that in England, in the days of Alfred the Great, golden bracelets might be safely hung up in the road. Whoever retains what he found when he knows who the owner is, or without using diligence to discover him, is a thief.

2. *In matters of violence.* Such as (1) "A thing taken away by violence." A horrible example is furnished in the case of the vineyard of Naboth (1 Kings xxi. 15, 16). (2) Any kind of oppression. Exactions under pressure of necessity. Exactions under threats. Withholding adequate remuneration for service (see Jas. ii. 6; v. 4-6).

II. AGGRAVATIONS OF THE WRONGS. These are: 1. *When lies are told to cover them.* (1) Some may have the hardihood stoutly to deny, in the face of witnesses to the contrary, that they came into fraudulent possession of property. (2) It is more easily denied when there are no witnesses to attest delivery, or prove custody or trust against the holder. (3) Lies are told in the forms of evasion, shuffling, and false colouring. 2. *When oaths are taken to give countenance to the lies.* (1) God is a *witness* of everything (2 Chron. xvi. 9; Ps. xxxiv. 15; Prov. xv. 3). He is often a silent observer. It is an awful aggravation of a wrong to think that it is done under the eye of God. (2) But when an oath is taken to cover a wrong, God is *appealed to*. What a fearful outrage against the God of truth, to be thus called in to attest a lie! (3) Whether a wrong be done before God as a "witness," which it must be if it is done at all; or whether he be "appealed" to by an oath, every trespass against man is also "a trespass against Jehovah" (see Jas. v. 4). Trespasses cannot, therefore, be treated lightly because of the insignificance of the person wronged, when the Almighty also is concerned. In all the interest which God takes in the justice of human actions, he has the good of man at heart.

III. THE LAW OF REPARATION. 1. *He shall make up the wrong to the person injured.* (1) "He shall restore it in the principal." If this cannot be done in the identical thing, then an "estimation" of its value must be taken, and payment made, viz. "in shekels of silver, after the shekel of the sanctuary" (comp. ch. v. 15). (2) "He shall add the fifth part more thereto." This is a proper consideration for the inconvenience the owner may have suffered through the fraud. But if the "estimation" be, as some read it in ch. v. 15, "two shekels," then the restoration would be "fourfold," since the atonement money was "half a shekel." This would agree with Exod. xxii. 1 (comp. also 2 Sam. xii. 6; Luke xix. 8). (3) And he shall "give it unto him to whom it appertaineth, in the day of his trespass offering." The trespass offering will not be accepted else. Job's friends had to make peace with him before their sacrifices would be accepted (Job xlvi. 8; see also Matt. v. 23, 24). 2. *He shall then bring his trespass offering unto the Lord.* (1) "A ram that is perfect." God will accept nothing that is imperfect. Therefore we must come to him through Christ, who can invest us with his righteousness. (2) "With thy estimation, for a trespass offering, unto the priest." This, according to ch. v. 15, would be of the value of two shekels. (3) "And the priest shall make an atonement for him" etc. Reflect: What a power there is in conscience! What a costly thing is sin! How carefully should it be avoided! Let us avail ourselves of the benefits of redemption.—J. A. M.

Vers. 1-7.—*Human ownership and dishonesty.* From the Divine directions here given as to the trespass offering, in the case of wrong between man and man, we gather—

I. THAT GOD ALLOWS US TO CONSIDER HIS GIFTS AS BELONGING TO OURSELVES. By inheritance or by labour we acquire property; a man has a right to say, concerning an object thus legally acquired, "This is mine." The possession of property is carefully guarded by the declarations of God's Word; "the commandments of the Lord" make the violation of this right a very serious sin (see text). It is well, however, to remember that human ownership is never absolute; it is subject to: 1. God's prior and supreme claim (Ps. xxiv. 1; 1 Chron. xxix. 11; Hag. ii. 8). 2. Our duty, in holding it, to keep in view the general good; e.g. large landowner has no right to let ground lie waste, and be covered with seed-sowing weeds. 3. Our liability, at any hour, to lay it down at God's will.

II. THAT MEN FIND VARIOUS WAYS OF DISREGARDING THIS RIGHT. Many forms of dishonesty prevail in every land; it is an inevitable excrescence of sin. Five special cases are here provided against: 1. Breach of trust, or failure to return anything borrowed; lying in "that which was delivered him to keep" (ver. 2). 2. Unfairness in partnership or co-operation; "in fellowship." 3. Violent appropriation or hardship

(oppression),—"a thing taken away by violence" (ver. 2). 4. Fraud in trading,—"hath deceived his neighbour" (ver. 2). 5. Illegal retention of something accidentally acquired,—"have found that which was lost," etc. (ver. 3).

III. THAT DISHONESTY IN ANY FORM IS A SERIOUS SIN AGAINST GOD, as well as a wrong done to our neighbour. By committing any one of these offences a soul is said to "sin, and commit a trespass against the Lord" (ver. 2); "he sins therein" (ver. 3); "he hath sinned, and is guilty." Evidently the taking from our neighbour "that which is his" is a high misdemeanour in the sight of God. Two of the "ten commandments" (Exod. xx.) are directed against it: "Thou shalt not steal;" "Thou shalt not covet," etc. Theft, dishonesty, is a treble sin: it is a wrong to our fellow; it is an injury to ourself (spiritual demoralization); it is an offence against God.

IV. THAT IT CALLS FOR RESTITUTION AS WELL AS SACRIFICE. 1. We must, indeed, bring our sacrifice to God. The Jew was to bring his "ram without blemish" (ver. 6), and an atonement was to be made before the Lord, and his trespass was forgiven him (ver. 7). We must bring the sacrifice of a contrite spirit, and plead the One Sacrifice for all sin, and we shall be forgiven. 2. But we are also bound to make restitution where that is possible. The Jew was to "restore it in the principal, and . . . add the fifth part more thereto" (ver. 5); he was to more than make up for the injury he had done. And (1) in order that the will of Christ concerning us in such case may be fully done (see Matt. v. 24), (2) that our own conscience may be perfectly clear and unstained, and (3) that our brother may have reason to be entirely satisfied with us,—let us make *not only adequate but ample* or even overflowing compensation for the wrong which we have done.—C.

Ver. 3.—*Sin a germ as well as a fruit.* It is contemplated by the Supreme Legislator, that if a man once cherish a dishonest thought, he will probably go beyond fraud to falsehood ("and lieth"), and, when necessary, from falsehood to perjury ("and sweareth falsely"). This is true to life. Sin is not only the consequence of the evil that came before it, but it is the cause of more sin which is to follow; it is not only the child but the parent of wrong. Learn that—

I. NO MAN WHO SINS CAN TELL HOW FAR HIS SIN WILL TAKE HIM. Hazael, Gehazi, Ahab, Judas, etc.; "facilius descensus Averni."

II. IT IS IN THE NATURE OF SIN TO TEMPT TO FURTHER SIN. The instances with which we are familiar are not remarkable exceptions; they are illustrations of a principle at work everywhere and always. "There's not a crime but takes its change out still in crime, when once rung on the counter of this world;" dishonesty naturally, if not necessarily, leads to lying, and lying to perjury. One sin is the germ of another, and is sure to bear fruit.

III. IT IS A PART OF THE PENALTY OF SIN THAT IT SHOULD DO SO. We sometimes think that sin carries no penalty; so it seemed to the Psalmist (Ps. lxxiii.), but he was wrong, as he owned (ver. 15). It not only ends disastrously ("then understood I their end"), but it results in certain, immediate, spiritual injury. On the day in which the forbidden fruit is eaten, we *do* die,—in the soul.

IV. THIS FACT OF THE DIFFUSIVENESS OF SIN HELPS TO EXPLAIN THE EXCEEDING EVIL OF IT IN THE SIGHT OF GOD. It may well be accounted "an evil and bitter thing," a thing which he "hates," which he "abhors," etc.

These considerations furnish (1) a very strong reason for repentance, etc.; and (2) an equally strong inducement for the cultivation of holiness in the heart and life of the good.—C.

Vers. 1—7.—*Trespasses done wittingly.* These were acts of lying, fraud, deceit, violence, or any social wrong involving conscious trespass on the rights of our neighbour.

I. SOCIAL MORALITY RESTS UPON RELIGION. Offences against neighbours, offences against God. No true support of society apart from faith. Follies of the modern sceptical school. Enthusiasm of humanity, atheism, development of morality out of a physical basis,—mere dreams of the intellect. Facts of history show that corrupt religion is corrupt morals; that an atheistic society is mere organized selfishness.

II. THE TRUE HEALING PRINCIPLE OF SOCIETY. The preservation of individual rights in the spirit of a common allegiance to God. We are all brethren. If one offend, let

his offence be both readily acknowledged and atoned for, and readily forgiven. So long as we simply pay back, we do not heal the hurt; we must more than pay back. His restitution was of the principal and the fifth part more thereto. Such a regulation was founded on the Divine love, as the essence of the Divine Law. We must remedy wrongs in the spirit of benevolence.

II. AS TYPICAL OF THE CROSS OF CHRIST, THE DIVINE FULNESS OF BEDEMPCTION is set forth. The offences of men are more than made up for. Their redeemed state is an advance upon their state of innocence. The new Law is better than the old. Christ in us is not only the crucifixion of sin and the world, but “the hope of glory.” The believer will find in the blood of the atonement both a cleansing away of guilt, and a washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost.—R.

#### EXPOSITION.

The following section (ch. vi. 8—vii. 38) is a supplement to ch. i.—vi. 7, containing the regulations addressed to the priests relating to the ritual of the several sacrifices. Vers. 8—13 of ch. vi. contain the further ritual of the burnt sacrifice; vers. 14—23, that of the meat offering; vers. 24—30, that of the sin offerings; vers. 1—6 of ch. vii., that of the trespass offering; vers. 11—36, that of the peace offering; vers. 7—10 declare the portion of the priests in all the offerings; vers. 37, 38 conclude the section.

Vers. 8—13.—(See note on ch. i. 8.) The further ritual of the burnt offering is exhibited in the particular instance of the lamb sacrificed every evening (Exod. xxix. 38). In other cases the ritual was to be the same. Instead of it is the burnt offering, because of the burning upon the altar all night unto the morning, the reading should be, *It, the burnt offering* (viz. the evening sacrifice), *shall burn upon the hearth upon the altar all night unto the morning*. The priest is to wear his priestly dress already appointed (Exod. xxviii. 40)—which was a white linen garment, covering the whole person like a close-fitting English surplice, fastened by a sash—while he is actually officiating at the altar; and thus vested, he is to remove from the altar the ashes which the fire hath consumed with the burnt offering, or rather, as it would be better translated, *the ashes to which the fire hath reduced the burnt offering*, and put them beside the altar, that is, on the ash-heap to the east of the altar. On leaving the court of the tabernacle, he is to change his dress, and to carry the ashes of the sacrifice without the camp unto a clean place. The priest is also instructed to lay fresh wood on the altar fire every morning, in preparation for the morning sacrifice of the lamb (Exod. xxix. 38). The fat of the peace offerings, that is, the parts of the peace offerings that were burnt on the altar, were laid on the burnt offering. The altar fire was never to go out, because the daily sacrifices constantly burn-

ing on the altar symbolized the unceasing worship of God by Israel, and the gracious acceptance of Israel by God. The ever-burning sacrifice was the token of the people being in communion with God.

Vers. 14—18.—The further ritual of the meat offering (see note on ch. ii. 1). The greater part of it is to be given to the priests, and they and the males of their families are to eat it without adding leaven to it. With unleavened bread shall it be eaten (ver. 16) should rather be rendered, *Unleavened shall it be eaten*. Not only is it most holy itself, but every one (or rather *everything*) that toucheth the offerings shall be holy. The touch of the offering conveys the character of holiness to the thing touched, which must, therefore, be treated as holy.

Vers. 19—23.—The meat offering of the high priest at his institution. This was to be not of uncooked flour, but in the form of a pancake, made out of one-tenth of an ephah of flour. It, of course, accompanied the burnt offering appointed for the occasion. Half of it was burnt in the morning, that is, at the morning sacrifice, and half thereof at night, that is, the other half at the evening sacrifice, none being reserved for consumption by the priests. This meat offering, having first been offered at the consecration of Aaron, was afterwards to be offered at the consecration of each succeeding high priest, the expression *Aaron and his sons* meaning here the successive high priests. The statement that the offering is to be perpetual, has led to the belief that it was made every day by the high priest, from the time of his consecration onwards, and there is thought to be an allusion to this sacrifice in Eccl. xlv. 14; but the more probable opinion is that it was only made on the day of consecration, that is, on the first day that he was qualified to act as high priest.

Vers. 24—30.—Further ritual of the sin offering (see note on ch. iv. 2). The flesh of the sin offerings is to be eaten by the priests and the males of their families in the holy place, that is, within the precincts of the sanctuary, with the exception of the sin

offerings of the high priest and of the congregation, whereof . . . the blood is brought into the tabernacle of the congregation to reconcile withal in the holy place, which was to be burnt in the fire without the camp. The holiness of the offering is manifested: 1.

By the command that no drop of the blood which might have been accidentally spilt upon the offerer's dress should be taken out of the tabernacle court. 2. By the order to break or scour the pot in which it was boiled for the priests' eating.

### HOMILETICS.

Vera. 8—30.—*The priests' ritual.* Hitherto the command had been, “Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them” (ch. i. 2; iv. 2); Command Aaron and his sons;” the reason being that the injunctions which follow are specially addressed to the future priesthood.

I. PRECISION OF THE POSITIVE RULES AND REGULATIONS GIVEN TO THE AARONIC PRIESTHOOD. Nothing is left to the individual's origination, all is ruled for him—every act that he performs, and each word that he speaks; and any failure in the ritual vitiates the whole ceremony.

II. CONTRAST IN THIS RESPECT WITH THE RITUAL OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. In the New Testament there are no such minute ritual regulations as in the Book of Leviticus. Search through the Gospels, and we find the principles of worship established. Search the Epistles, and we find order and uniformity in religious ministrations commanded, but no such specifications of manual acts as those given in the earlier dispensation.

III. THE REASON OF THE DIFFERENCE. It is a higher and a nobler state to be allowed freely to apply a principle than to be bound down to a certain course by a definite and unchanging rule. The former is the conditions of sons, the latter of servants. “The servant knoweth not what his lord doeth.” The Jew was in this position. He did not know what it was that he was representing and rehearsing in type. He must, therefore, be hedged about with rules, lest, in his darkness and ignorance, he should go astray and mar the lesson that he had unwittingly to teach. But “henceforth,” says our Lord, “I call you not servants, for the servant knoweth not what his lord doeth, but I have called you friends.” Accordingly, just as in matters of morals the principles contained in the Sermon on the Mount are given to Christians instead of bare negative or positive rules of conduct; so in matters of worship, certain principles are laid down as to the nature of true worship and how it is to be offered (John iv. 21—24), and a few general rules commanding uniformity and order in public worship (1 Cor. iv. 17; xi. 16; xiv. 33, 40), and declaring its ends to be the edification of the people (1 Cor. xiv. 26); and then the work of composing its Liturgy and common prayers is delivered to the Church without any other restraint than that of embodying in them settled forms of administration of the two sacraments of Baptism (Matt. xxviii. 19) and of the Lord's Supper (Matt. xxvi. 26; Mark xiv. 22; Luke xxii. 19; 1 Cor. xi. 26), using the Lord's Prayer (Luke xi. 2), and of “asking” in the name of Jesus Christ (John xvi. 24). Therefore, “it is not necessary” in the Christian Church, as it was in the Jewish Church, that “ceremonies be in all places one, and utterly like: for at all times they have been divers, and may be changed according to the diversities of countries, times, and men's manners, so that nothing be ordained against God's Word. . . . Every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish, ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying” (Art. XXXIV.).

IV. A PRECOMPOSED LITURGY IS NOT displeasing to God. However much the liberty of the Christian Church may in this respect be superior to Jewish bondage, yet it is evident from the Levitical laws and regulations that a prearranged and formal method of approaching God is in accordance with his will, as recorded in his holy Word.

### HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

*Quench not the Spirit.* Ch. vi. 8—30. Cf. Eph. iv. 30; 1 Thess. v. 19. We have here sundry sacrificial laws enabling us the better to understand the details of the preceding sacrifices; but the cardinal idea in them all, as we shall now see, is that which heads this homily, “Quench not the Spirit.” And—

**I. THE FIRE OF THE BURNT OFFERING WAS TO BE CAREFULLY PRESERVED, SO THAT IT SHOULD NEVER GO OUT.** This necessitated a regular removal of the ashes to the clean place selected for their reception without the camp. These ashes represented what would not ascend in the fire, and were a fitting symbol of the dross and corruption which attaches to all human services. Everything which would prevent the fire from burning was to be removed. Now, we have already seen that the fire of the altar symbolizes the Holy Spirit. It is what came from God in the first instance, and what renders the sacrifice acceptable. Hence the lesson about the perpetuation of the altar-fire is to remove everything which would hinder or would quench the free action of the Spirit within us. The purer we try to be, the freer will the movements of the Holy Ghost be within us. On the other hand, negligence in life must interrupt the spiritual action. Let us diligently use every means, like the priest laying on the wood and clearing away the ashes from the altar, and the Holy Spirit as a fire within us will make us ardent and enthusiastic in the Divine life.

**II. NEW OBEDIENCE OUGHT TO BE AS HOLY IN OUR EYES AS ATONEMENT.** This principle is symbolized for us in the details about the meat offering (vers. 14—18). For the priests are not only to burn carefully the due proportion upon the altar, but also to prepare the remainder for themselves without leaven, and to regard it as a "holy of holies" (כְּלֵלָה), like the sin offering and the trespass offering. If, then, we saw reason to regard the meat offering as emphasizing the idea of *consecrated life-work*, this direction to the priests about regarding the meat offering as just as holy as the sin offering or trespass offering, embodies the idea that "new obedience" should be as holy in our eyes as "atonement." Now, there is no principle more likely to please the Holy Spirit, to foster his indwelling, and to maintain his reign. The whole Christian life is elevated in tone when this ideal is comprehended. The perfection of our Saviour's atonement and righteousness is to be the model of our lives.

**III. A CLASS IS NEEDFUL WHOSE SELF-DENYING LIVES ARE ABOVE SUSPICION.** This seems taught by the arrangement that the meat offering of the priests must be wholly burnt (vers. 19—23). The life-work is to be all consecrated, all a dedicated thing. Never are the officers of God to be "off duty," "out of season" as well as "in season" should they serve God.

Now, the self-denial of a class of men, if realized, goes far to secure the continuance and blessing of the Spirit. The Holy Spirit is the Spirit of self-denial—this is the most important evidence of his work—and the demonstration of this to men is a concomitant of his abiding.

It need hardly be observed—it is so evident—that Jesus, our Great High Priest, realized self-denial in all its fulness. He could say, as none other can, "My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish his work" (John iv. 34). Every portion of our Lord's life-work was laid upon the altar, permeated with the oil of the Spirit, and enveloped in the incense of prayer. It is for priestly believers to follow in his steps.

**IV. THE CONSECRATING POWER OF THE ATONING SACRIFICE SHOULD BE KEPT CONSTANTLY IN VIEW.** In the remaining verses (vers. 24—30), we have brought before us the intense holiness of the sin offering. It is to be regarded as a "holy of holies" (כְּלֵלָה). In ordinary cases the priest is to eat that which remains after God's share has been offered on the altar, to sustain him in his atoning duties, and to sustain also his sense of consecration. In the more important cases, such as are referred to in ch. iv. 1—21, the remainder of the animal was to be carried out to the clean place outside the camp, and burned there in the place of the ashes. Moreover, every person and thing which touched the flesh was thereby consecrated. So intensely holy was the atoning sacrifice, that it pervaded with its sanctifying power everything in contact with it.

That this is typical is clear. A similar but much more real consecration attaches to the atoning sacrifice of Christ. And this great truth must be kept in view if we would preserve the Spirit within us. To separate consecration from the atoning work of Jesus must ever be grieving to the Spirit, whose chief mission is to take of the things of Christ and show them unto men (John xvi. 14, 15).

We have thus discovered in these miscellaneous laws what course we should follow, if the Spirit is not to be quenched within us but is to abide. We must diligently use the appointed means, we must have the highest possible ideal of a consecrated life,

and we must give all honour to the atoning sacrifice of Jesus. In such circumstances we shall retain, in large and abiding measure, the Holy Spirit within us.—R. M. E.

Ver. 13.—*The ever-burning fire.* The special directions for the benefit of the priests are fittingly separated from the instructions common to all the people. In front of the tabernacle stood the altar of burnt offering, and on this a fire was kept constantly burning, in obedience to the injunction of the text. For a description of the altar, see Exod. xxvii. 1—8. Let us advance in thought, and behold the flames and curling smoke, and hear the lessons the fire preaches.

I. Consider it as **THE FULFILMENT OF AN ORDINANCE.** From his relationship to God, man is bound to obey him, and this same relationship causes that the majority of God's utterances to man are in the nature of commands, such commands, however, containing virtual promises. *And those are most honoured who have most commands.* The priests occupied the highest posts in the estimation of the people, simply because they were entirely devoted to the behests of the Almighty. To lay sticks in order upon the altar and set fire to them, was in itself a humble occupation, but the fact that it was performed for the glory of God elevated its character in the eyes of all. *Menial duties are ennobled when discharged as unto the Lord.* The fire was an emblem of worship, of praise, and supplication, ascending to the Most High from his faithful people. *That it was perpetual indicated God's desire to be worshipped, not with fitful enthusiasm, but with steady regularity.* There were times when the fuel was renewed, just as men may have their seasons of devotion at morning and at night, on the Lord's day and on a certain week-day, but there must be always a flame of service to testify to the obedience and affection of the people. The fire was kept alight by successive generations in their turn. *To no one age is it exclusively given to sound the praises and do the will of the Eternal.* When one servant falls asleep, having done the will of God, his younger comrade must step into his place and continue the work. Even the materials so soon to be consumed must be deposited upon the altar in an orderly manner. It is said by the rabbins that care was taken in selecting the sticks, no rotten ones being allowed. *Whatever is done for God must be done to the best of our ability.*

II. Consider it as **THE ENJOYMENT OF A PRIVILEGE.** Once the fire was consecrated by the approach thereto of the glorious fire from God's presence instantly consuming the sacrifice (ch. ix. 24). The flames became henceforth *a token of God's acceptance of the offerings of his servants, and his consequent reconciliation and favour.* If any Israelite doubted the reality of Jehovah's existence or his willingness to bless the nation, a glance at the fire was sufficient to dismiss all doubt, and to inspire his breast with a consciousness of blessing.

The perpetual fire symbolized *God's unchangeable protection of his people.* Through the hours of daylight and through the watches of the night the flames ascended on high; they knew no cessation; they spoke of him who "never slumbers nor sleeps," upon whose brightness no darkening shadow ever rests. This altar-fire consumed the various offerings presented. *It kindled other fires*—from it the burning coals for the golden altar of incense were taken; it was the fire-foundation on which the sacrifices were laid, and by which they were consecrated. It is the loving sacrifice of Christ that generates holy lives in his followers. By his ascension the fire of the Holy Spirit descended upon the Church, kindling sparks of hallowed emotion, and making the thoughts and words and acts of Christians an ever-brightening blaze of sacred service.—S. R. A.

Vers. 25—29.—*The holiness of the sin offering.* This offering was to expiate offences committed directly against God, and which involved, therefore, the deeper wrong. A peculiar sacredness attached to the sacrifice. Only the priests might partake of it, for it was "most holy." As all Christians are made "priests unto God," it is permitted them to feed upon him who died to save them from sin. They live by faith in the Son of God. Union with their Divine Lord consecrates them, imperishable principles sustain them.

I. **WHAT IS OFFERED UNTO GOD ACQUIRES THEREBY A SACRED CHARACTER.** It is set apart, belongs to him henceforth. He accepts the gift, and his holiness is imparted to all his possessions. His people are holy, and so are his house and his statutes.

Christ, having dedicated himself to the Father, could declare “I sanctify myself.” It is no light matter for a man to take upon himself allegiance to a holy God, to “vow to be his, yea, his alone.” God himself must sanctify us wholly, that body, soul, and spirit may be preserved blameless. Some article of furniture that is owned by a celebrated monarch is invested with importance by that fact, and numbers view it with eager interest. The servant wearing his famous master’s livery is regarded with attention. Surely, then, those are worth our notice who are consecrated to the service of the King of kings, vessels meet for his use.

II. HOLINESS TENDS TO COMMUNICATE ITSELF TO ALL THAT IS BROUGHT INTO CONTACT WITH IT. Whoever touches the sin offering shall be holy. Like leaven, the sacredness spreads. The prospect of the world’s improvement lies in the hope of its permeation by Christian principle. By touching the Saviour, the sick were healed, and by placing the hand of faith now upon Christ’s bleeding body, the sinner is sanctified in the sight of God. That holiness extends is recognized in the apostle’s declaration, that “the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife.” Continual contact with sacred rites and offerings renewed the holiness of the priests. So let us seek to draw near unto our God by the Living Way, having our hearts sprinkled and bodies washed.

III. In spite of this consecrating power, **WHAT IS HOLY MUST NOT BE THOUGHTLESSLY PLACED IN PROPINQUITY WITH WHAT IS DEFILING.** Let blood from the offering stain the garment, and it must be cleansed “in the holy place,” not carried without into the region of things common and unclean. If the flesh was boiled in an earthen vessel, the fat might penetrate through the porous surface, so that no after rinsing or scouring would remove it, as in the case of copper (“brazen”) vessels. The earthen pot must consequently be broken, to prevent all risk of any portion of a sin offering being contaminated by touching subsequent food. Learn from this not to profane what is dedicated to God. Our Lord’s words to Mary after his resurrection are significant: “Touch me not.” The precept of Paul was, “Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness?” We must not cast pearls before swine. Let us not commingle sordid motives and methods with the worship of the sanctuary. Jests founded upon the Word of God are to be shunned. Previous prayer will not sanction worldly entertainments and amusements. In many directions the regulations of Leviticus may be remembered with advantage to-day.—S. R. A.

Vers. 8—13.—*The law of the burnt offering.* With this paragraph the Jews begin the twenty-fifth section of the Law; and, as a new subject is here introduced, this ought to have been the commencement of the chapter. In some of the best editions of the Hebrew Bible, the paragraph preceding this is properly made the sequel of the fifth chapter, and the sixth commences with this. The burnt offering was treated of before, viz. in the first chapter, with more particular reference to ceremonies relating to those who brought it; here it is considered in relation to the priests who offered it. We have now to consider—

I. **THE LAW OF THE BURNED OFFERING AS TO THE SACRIFICE.** And we observe: 1. *That the offering was ever upon the altar.* (1) The evening sacrifice was “burning upon the altar all night unto the morning.” For the particular reference here is to the daily sacrifice of a lamb for the whole congregation. (2) This was then followed by the corresponding morning sacrifice. This, together with the occasional sacrifices which were offered throughout the day, would keep the altar fully occupied until the evening. (3) Thus there was kept up a constant “remembrance of sins” day by day, the year round, and “year by year continually.” For the repetition of the sacrifices showed that “they could never take away sins.” These could only be removed “through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once” (see Heb. x. 1—10). 2. *That the fire was kept ever burning.* (1) This was not common fire, but came forth from God (see ch. ix. 23, 24). It was an emblem of the Holy Spirit; and sometimes represented his wrath, sometimes his love (Isa. iv. 4; Mal. iii. 2, 3; Matt. iii. 11; Acts ii. 3, 4; Heb. x. 26, 27; xii. 29). (2) God commanded that it should “not be put out.” He will consume with the fire of his wrath those who quench the fire of his love. Even if we be not always offering sacrifices, love must be kept always burning in the heart (1 Thessa. v. 19; 2 Tim. i. 6). (3) The priests were instructed how they should keep it alive. They were to put on wood. On this to lay the burnt offering. So the Great Sacrifice

was laid on the wood of the cross, when the fires of God's wrath entered into his very soul. The fat of the peace offerings was placed on the burnt offering. So the fire was maintained (see Isa. xxxi. 9). The fire was kept ever burning, to show that God's wrath could never be quenched until the blood of Christ should quench it.

II. THE LAW OF THE BURNT OFFERING AS TO THE PRIEST. 1. "*Aaron and his sons*" together are addressed. Ver. 9. (1) The high priest of the Law was undoubtedly a type of the "Great High Priest of our profession." When Aaron, the high priest, is here mentioned with his sons, the priests, the suggestion is that in his absence they acted as his representatives in connection with the burnt offering. So here they also may be viewed as types of Christ. (2) The sons of Aaron, in their character of ordinary priests, represent Christians. In what they did, therefore, there may have been a two-fold typical meaning. 2. *They attended the altar in their holy garments.* (1) These were composed of white linen. "His linen garment, and his linen breeches" (Exod. xxviii. 40—43). They symbolized purity and righteousness (Ps. cxxxii. 9; Rev. iii. 4; vii. 13, 14; xix. 8). (2) As types of Christ in offering up his own sacrifice of himself to God, they would shadow forth his righteousness. As typifying Christians, they would foreshow how we must be clothed with the "robe of righteousness and garment of salvation" through Christ's merits, before our spiritual sacrifices can be accepted. (3) Even when the priest took up the ashes from the consuming burnt offering to put them beside the altar, he wore his holy garments. This was proper, for the fire was still consuming the sacrifice. But, 3. *He changed his garments to carry the ashes outside.* (1) He had to carry them forth without the camp. Was not Calvary this place of ashes (comp. ch. iv. 12; Heb. xiii. 11, 12)? (2) But they were to be laid in a "clean place." The tomb of Joseph was such a place. It had not been polluted by the touch of a dead body (see John xix. 41, 42). Nor did the ashes of the world's Great Burnt Offering pollute it. They were holy. Because he was the "Holy One" of God, his body "could not see corruption" (Acts ii. 31). (3) The holy raiment was laid aside when this service was performed, to show that now, as far as the work of sacrifice was concerned, that was "finished" when Jesus expired upon the cross. Let us rejoice in an "eternal redemption," in an "everlasting salvation."—J. A. M.

Vers. 14—23.—*The law of the meat offering.* As the law of the burnt offering, laid down in the preceding paragraph, viz. in relation to the service of the priest, was before mentioned, more particularly in respect to the offerer, so is the law of the meat, or more properly the bread, offering, here introduced for a similar reason, after being formerly mentioned likewise (see ch. ii.). The subject is presented in two aspects, and we have to consider—

I. THE LAW OF THE BREAD OFFERING OF THE PEOPLE. In this case: 1. *A memorial of it was burnt upon the altar.* (1) The memorial represented the whole. The bulk consisted of at least an omer, or about three of our quarts, of fine flour, of which a handful was taken for the memorial. There was with the omer of flour, a log, or little more than a half pint, of oil, of which a fitting quantity was added to the handful of flour. The memorial was completed by the addition of all the frankincense. As the name of a thing stands for the thing, so did the memorial stand for the whole offering; it was like a *quit rent*, a discharge for all demands on the estate. (2) It was burnt upon the altar for a sweet savour unto the Lord. It could not be *that* to him in a physical sense; this expression must be *morally* interpreted. (a) It was a thank offering, and gratitude from his intelligent offspring is ever pleasing to his goodness (Ps. xxvii. 6; I. 23; Rom. xii. 1; 1 Thess. v. 18). (b) It was placed on the altar of burnt offerings, and mingled among the sacrifices offered, to make atonement for sin, and so, coming up as it were "through Jesus Christ" in whom the Father is ever well pleased, it becomes "acceptable" (1 Pet. ii. 5). 2. *The remainder was eaten by Aaron and his sons.* (1) Aaron ate of it, who was the type of Christ; and his sons also, who were types of Christians. So Jesus and his disciples together ate the Passover (Luke xxii. 15). And he gave to his disciples the bread and wine of his Eucharist. (2) The bread offering was to be eaten without leaven. This substance was regarded as an emblem of evil dispositions, malice, wickedness, insincerity (1 Cor. v. 6—8). These must be absent from those who feast with Jesus. (3) It was to be eaten in the holy place. This holy place was not the innermost court, which

was a type of "heaven itself" (Heb. ix. 24). It is explained to be the "court of the tabernacle of the congregation," which was a figure of the Church in its earthly aspect—the kingdom of heaven upon earth. Those who elect to worship God outside his Church, are not following out his instructions. (4) The males only must eat of it. The daughters of the priests were permitted to eat of the "holy things," such as might be carried out of the court, such as the tithes and firstfruits, and the shoulder and breast of the peace offerings. But of the "most holy things" eaten in the sanctuary they may not eat. It was the Seed of the woman who is most holy, not the woman herself; the son, not the daughter, therefore, was holy unto God. Now that most holy Seed has come, the distinction between male and female is abolished (Gal. iii. 28). (5) The priest must not eat it unless he be clean. "Every one that toucheth it shall be holy" (ver. 18). To eat and drink unworthily of the Christian Eucharist is a serious thing (see 1 Cor. xi. 27-34).

II. THE LAW OF THE BREAD OFFERING OF THE PRIESTS. In this case: 1. *The whole was offered upon the altar.* (1) Here was no "memorial," as in the offering of the people. The omer of fine flour was all burnt upon the altar (ver. 23). "Had the priests been permitted to live on their own offerings, as they did on those of the people, it would have been as if they had offered *nothing*, as they would have taken again to themselves what they appeared to give unto the Lord" (A. Clarke). (2) It was offered in two portions: half in the morning, and the complement at night (ver. 20). And as it is called a "meat offering perpetual," it is generally understood that the high priest repeated this offering daily throughout his pontificate. (3) This he appears to have done not for himself only, but on behalf of the priesthood in general. This seems expressed in the words, "This is the offering of Aaron and of his sons, which *they* shall offer unto the Lord in the day when *he* is anointed," etc. (ver. 20). Here "they" offer it; but afterwards we read, "And the priest of his sons that is anointed in his stead," viz. as high priest at his demise, "shall offer it" (ver. 22). Taken together, these passages show that the high priest offered it for the priesthood in general. 2. *None of it was to be eaten by the priests.* (1) It appears to have been of the nature of the sin offering; for there is no frankincense offered with it. This was the case with the poor man's sin offering (see ch. v. 11). In sin there is nothing grateful to God. (2) By his eating of the sin offerings, the typical transfer of the sins of the people to the priest was signified (see ch. x. 17). It would not be proper, therefore, for him to eat the sin offering in which he was personally concerned. He must rather see his sin transferred to the altar, and there consumed along with the lamb of the daily sacrifice. So may we see our sins consumed.—J. A. M.

Vers. 24-30.—*The law of the sin offering.* This law comprehends a variety of particulars, which may be ranged under two heads—

I. AS IT RESPECTS THE BLEEDING. The particulars under this head are: 1. *The place:* "Where the burnt offering is killed shall the sin offering be killed." (1) In the account of the sin offering (ch. iv.), the place is implied rather than specified; but the position of the altar is described in the account of the burnt offering. It stood "at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation," and the burnt offering was killed "on the side of the altar northward" (ch. i. 3, 5, 11). Accordingly, Jesus "suffered without the gate," and Calvary was northward of Jerusalem. The evangelical teaching is that a sinner has access to God only through Christ, who declares himself to be the "Door" and the "Way" (John x. 9; xiv. 6). (2) The association here of the sin offering with the burnt offering is significant. The burnt offering expressed adoration, and was offered for sin generally. The sin offering was more specific. Confession of sin should be particular, and faith individual, fully to realize the benefits of the common salvation (1 Tim. iv. 10). Let no man trust vaguely to the provisions of mercy. Let the sinner see in the death of Christ the very image of himself, with all his iniquities and abominations, suffering and satisfying the claims of Divine justice. 2. *The presence:* "Before the Lord" (ver. 25). (1) This means more than being in the presence of One who is omnipresent. There was a manifestation of a special presence of Jehovah in the glory behind the veil. In a special sense Jesus promises to be present where two or three are met in his name. (2) This presence of God was at once judicial and merciful. The throne of his glory was a propitiatory, but he was there armed with fire to smite

with destruction any who dared to set him at defiance (Ps. xcvi. 2, 3; lxxxix. 14). 3. *The reason* : “It is most holy” (ver. 25). What? (1) Not the sin laid on the sacrifice. Sin seen in the sacrifice is exceeding sinful. That which could cause the Son of God his agonies is horrible and abominable in the extreme. (2) Not the sin, but its condemnation in the sacrifice. The sacrifice of Christ, by which sin is removed out of the sight of God, is indeed “most holy.” Had Jesus not been “most holy,” he could never have accomplished this miracle of grace and mercy. (3) The blood of the sin offering, if sprinkled upon any garment, must be washed out within the sanctuary. And if the blood of the type must not be treated as a common thing, much more must we reverence that blood which cleanseth from all sin.

II. AS IT RESPECTS THE EATING. 1. *It was to be eaten by the priest.* “The priest that offereth it for sin shall eat it.” (1) By this ceremony the “sin” (*ruwm, chattath*) became, in a sense, assimilated in the body of the priest (see ch. x. 17; Hos. iv. 8). This represented the manner in which Christ, becoming incarnate among us, appeared “in the likeness of men,” and “in the likeness of sinful flesh” (Rom. viii. 3; 2 Cor. v. 21; Phil. ii. 6—8). (2) The converse of this is in the Eucharist, in which we symbolically partake of the pure body of Christ. As he became assimilated to our likeness that he might expiate sin by the sacrifice of himself, so we now become assimilated to his pure nature that we may inherit the rewards of his righteousness. There is a mystical incarnation of Christ in his believing people (Eph. iii. 16—19). 2. *It was to be eaten in the holy place* (ver. 26). (1) Observe, not in the most holy place; that place within the veil in which the Shechinah abode between the cherubim. That was the type of the heaven of heavens, where the “angels do always behold the face of God” (Matt. xviii. 10). No sin could enter there (Isa. xxxv. 8—10; lx. 20—22; Rev. xxi. 27; xxii. 14, 15). (2) But “in the court of the tabernacle of the congregation,” the type of the Church in its earthly aspect, which is entered by way of the laver of washing and the altar of sacrifice. It is while we remain in this world that we can avail ourselves of the provisions of mercy. 3. *But certain sin offerings must not be eaten.* (1) The priests were forbidden to eat of those whose blood was brought into the tabernacle to reconcile withal (ver. 30; see also ch. iv. 5, 6, 16, 17). (2) In this the gospel is superior to the Law. Jesus has carried his blood into the holy place of the true temple, to reconcile withal (Heb. ix. 11, 12). Yet we may eat of his altar (Heb. xiii. 10—12). (3) Those who serve the tabernacle have no right to eat of our altar, because the tabernacle law forbids them; therefore to avail themselves of the gospel they must renounce the Law (see Gal. v. 3, 4). And their case is fearful who now attempt to make atonement for themselves, for they “shall be burnt in the fire” (ver. 30). Such is the peril of those who trust to works of supererogation or to anything but Christ.—

J. A. M.

Vers. 8—13.—*Three principles of piety.* We gather from this clause—

I. THAT HOLINESS BECOMES THE HOUSE OF GOD. It seems generally agreed that the linen garments, in which the priests were to be robed when engaged in sacrificial acts (ver. 10), signified the purity of heart which should characterize the worshipper of God (see Exod. xxviii. 42; Ezek. xliv. 19). Certainly it is only the “pure in heart” who can hope to “see God,” either by faith here or in beatific vision hereafter (see Ps. xciii. 5).

II. THAT THERE IS NO DRUDGERY IN THE SERVICE OF GOD. Very homely and humble details of sacred work were to be done by the officiating priest. He was to be very careful as to the clothes he wore, changing them at regulated times (vers. 10, 11); he was to “take up the ashes . . . and put them beside the altar” (ver. 10), and to “carry forth the ashes without the camp,” etc. (ver. 11). These acts were mean enough in themselves. Elsewhere they would have been accounted menial, but in so sacred a service as the direct worship of Jehovah they acquired sanctity, and even dignity. They were solemn ceremonies, reverently performed. The slightest engagement in the worship of God deserves to be esteemed sacred (Ps. lxxxiv. 10). Any humble deed done or simple word spoken, (1) as in the presence of the observing and approving Master, or (2) consciously and designedly for the glory of his name, or (3) as unto one for whom he died and whom he loves (Matt. x. 40—42), rises to high rank in the esteem of Heaven. The cheerful, loving service of a Divine Redeemer

does not contain one act of drudgery; it is all upon the high level of holy, happy, elevating service.

III. THAT THERE MUST BE CONSTANCY IN OUR CONSECRATION TO GOD. “The fire shall ever be burning upon the altar; it shall never go out” (ver. 13). As soon as the victim was slain and his shed blood was sprinkled on the altar, there was forgiveness and acceptance, and the burning of the whole animal by the heaven-kindled fire indicated the accepted consecration of the offerer. When, therefore, the priest was instructed to keep the fire perpetually burning on the altar, it signified God’s readiness to receive the perpetual devotion of the Israelites themselves to him and to his service. To us the most instructive lesson it conveys is that we must keep steadily and unfailingly burning the fire of consecration in our hearts;—that must “never go out.” 1. The passions of youth must not be permitted to extinguish it. 2. Nor the toils and anxieties of our prime. 3. Nor the mysterious and perplexing troubles that, like overwhelming billows (Ps. xlii. 7), go over us. 4. Nor the distressing doubts which the enemies of the faith raise within us. 5. Nor the comforts and indulgences of prosperous periods in our life. It must be diligently and devoutly fed by (1) earnest thought—meditation; (2) regular worship with the people of God; (3) steadfast Christian work; and (4) the private believing prayer which finds such utterance as this, “O thou who camest from above!” etc.—C.

Vers. 14—18.—“*Fellowship with the Father.*” In these renewed directions (see ch. ii.) concerning the meat offering, we have the striking expression, “I have given it unto them for their portion of my offerings” (ver. 17). So that this sacrifice, beside furnishing an opportunity to the people of acknowledging their indebtedness to God as the generous Giver of all blessings, provided an opportunity to the priests of fellowship with God. He shared these “his offerings” with his ministers, and they ate with him “in the holy place” (ver. 16), within the precincts of his house. “And truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ” (1 John i. 3). In Divine and human fellowship under the gospel, there is—

I. FEASTING TOGETHER. The truest Christian counterpart of the sacred service described in the text is found in the Lord’s Supper. There we, who are all “priests unto God” (Rev. i. 6; 1 Pet. ii. 5, 9), meet at the table of the Lord (1 Cor. x. 21), and eat and drink in his presence, rejoicing in his redeeming love, renewing before him our vows.

II. SPEAKING ONE TO ANOTHER. 1. *God to man* in (1) the pages of revelation; (2) the words of those whom his Spirit prompts to remind us of his will or to explain it; (3) the direct communications of his Spirit. 2. *Man to God* in (1) the accents of praise; (2) the breath of supplication.

III. REJOICING IN ONE ANOTHER. 1. *God in man* (Deut. xxxii. 9; Ps. xxxv. 27; cxlvii. 11; Hab. iii. 18; Eph. v. 27; Rev. xxi. 2). 2. *Man in God* (Ps. xvi. 5; lxxxix. 16; cxlix. 2; Phil. iii. 3; iv. 4).

IV. WORKING TOGETHER. We are “workers together with him” (2 Cor. vi. 1); “labourers together with God” (1 Cor. iii. 9). While God is working in us and through us, he is also working with us; united with us in working out the reconciliation and regeneration of the world.—C.

Vers. 27—29.—*Communicated sanctity.* When any victim had been presented in sacrifice to God, and had been slain, its blood (the “blood of atonement”), and also its flesh, became “most holy” (ver. 29). And whatsoever was touched by the one or the other received, in virtue of such contact, a communicated sanctity (vers. 27, 28). The lesson here conveyed is that whatsoever comes into close association with a holy one or a holy thing does thereby acquire a measure of sacredness, and should be treated accordingly by us. This imparted sanctity gives back again to that which acts upon it some additional importance; it reflects that which it receives on the object from which it comes. We have abundant illustration of this truth; sanctity is communicated—

I. FROM THE GOD-MAN TO HUMAN NATURE. Man is far more to God and to the spiritual universe now that the “Word was made flesh,” that “himself” was “partaker of flesh and blood.” In Jesus Christ the Divine touched the human, and henceforth the human is holy.

II. FROM THE LIFE AND DEATH OF JESUS CHRIST TO THE LIFE AND DEATH OF MEN. Poverty, shame, sorrow, tears, the grave,—are not these other than they were, sacred things, since he “had not where to lay his head;” since the crown of thorns rested on that sacred head; since the Man of sorrows bore his burden; since “Jesus wept;” since they “laid him in a sepulchre”?

III. FROM THE SERVICE TO THE SANCTUARY. “This is none other than the house of God.”

IV. FROM THE FUNCTION TO THE MINISTER. “Esteem them very highly in love for their work’s sake.”

V. FROM THE SPIRIT TO THE BODY. The exceeding preciousness of the human spirit imparts a sanctity to the body which is its residence and organ.

VI. FROM THE TRUTH TO THE WORD. We must deal reverently with the words in which the eternal truth of God is uttered.—C.

Vers. 19—23.—*Ministerial function and obligation.* This instruction is supplementary to that given in Exod. xxix. We may gather from it—

I. THAT ENTRANCE ON SACRED WORK SHOULD BE ACCOMPANIED WITH SPECIAL SOLEMNITIES. The commencement of any ministry may well be attended with such observances as shall impress upon the mind the sanctity and weight of the obligations which are incurred.

II. THAT THE ACCEPTANCE OF SACRED OBLIGATIONS SHOULD BE REGARDED AS A TIME FOR THANKFULNESS AS WELL AS SERIOUSNESS OF SPIRIT. The priest was to bring a “meat offering”—fine flour and oil (vers. 20, 21)—the token of gratitude for God’s bountiful provision. There are, in truth, few things for which we have such reason to be thankful to God as for his providential guidance to that post for which we are fitted, at which we can usefully expend our powers; more particularly if this be one in close connection with his service.

III. THAT THOSE WHO HOLD SACRED OFFICES ARE, WITH ALL THE PEOPLE OF GOD, STEWARDS OF THEIR SECULAR POSSESSIONS. The priest, as well as the layman in Israel, was to bring his meat offering. He, too, was indebted to the Divine Sovereign for all temporal blessings, and should make suitable acknowledgment of his debt. Those who now serve in sacred things, in the gospel of the Saviour, are men who receive and hold secular as well as spiritual treasures, and they, too, have their obligations, which they must not disregard.

IV. THAT WHAT WE GIVE TO GOD AND HIS CAUSE SHOULD BE GIVEN ABSOLUTELY, WITHOUT THOUGHT OF RETURN. The people gave their offerings, part being burnt and the rest being the portion of the priests; but every “meat offering for the priest was to be wholly burnt: it was not to be eaten” (ver. 23). The priests were not to *take back again* for their own use that which they had presented to God. What they offered was to be given wholly, utterly, with no thought of receiving it again. When we give to our brother, we do best when we are “hoping for nothing again” (Luke vi. 35). When we give to God, either in worship or in contribution to his cause and kingdom, we do best when we are filled with a sense of his immeasurable goodness to us, and with a desire to do something to his praise. We should feel that (1) it is a high honour to be allowed to give anything to him, and that (2) the utmost we can give is a poor tribute indeed when presented to him who gave himself for us.—C.

Vers. 8—30.—*Instructions on the offerings for the priests.* Ver. 13, “The fire shall ever be burning upon the altar; it shall never go out.”

I. THE PERPETUITY OF RELIGIOUS OBLIGATION. 1. As springing out of the *relation between man and God*, as underlying the whole of human existence. “*In him we live, and move, and have our being.*” 2. *The all-embracing love of God.* The fire came originally from him, and must be kept up to betoken his ceaseless care of his creatures. 3. *The positive expression of religious feeling* can never be dispensed with, should be maintained in uninterrupted order.

II. The maintenance of worship is A DUTY WHICH IS DEVOLVED UPON CONSECRATED PERSONS, and their official position, in an especial manner. Vain to expect that the fire will not go out, unless appointed persons attend to it. Mere individualism is abuse of liberty, and ends in irreligious disorder and extinction of the fire of God’s house.

Priestcraft is no argument against a special ministry in the Church. All must help to maintain the fire, but some must take the command as addressed to them in a special manner. They must separate themselves to the work, both by appropriate manner of life and recognition of special duties. Religion is not only in temples, but if the fire goes out there, it will go out everywhere.—R.

Vers. 14—18.—*Meat offering.* “All the males of the sons of Aaron shall eat of it,” with unleavened bread, in the court of the tabernacle of the congregation. “It is most holy, as is the sin offering, and as the trespass offering.” “Every one that toucheth them shall be holy.”

I. THE MINISTRY OF RELIGION SHOULD BE FULFILLED IN THE SPIRIT OF THANKFUL DEVOTION. 1. The best of the Church should be consecrated to its highest positions. 2. Their service should be rendered as a delight. 3. Their religious earnestness and cheerfulness should be cultivated by fellowship and brotherhood. 4. They should be closely united with the people, not separated from them by spiritual pride and a misanthropic asceticism.

II. HOLINESS THE IMPERATIVE REQUIREMENT OF GOD'S MINISTERS. Not mere ceremonial holiness. 1. Holiness of character and life. 2. Holiness in the service of the sanctuary—purity of worship, singleness of heart, orderliness and decency, with simplicity and manifest sincerity.

III. THE SANCTIFYING INFLUENCE OF A TRUE AND PURE WORSHIP EXTENDS THROUGHT SOCIETY. Every one holy by contact with the holy. 1. *The persuasive effect* of a real and well-sustained religious service. The common mistake is to suppose that morality leads of itself to religion or may be substituted for it. 2. *The true order of life* is set before us here in the Law of Moses: the nearer to God, the holier; the more closely connected with the worship of God, the more separated from and defended against the impurities of the world. 3. *The reaction of the holy life on the sanctuary.* The revival of religion must be a reciprocal action of the Church on the ministry, and of the ministry on the Church.—R.

Vers. 19—23.—The high priest's offering in the day when he is anointed—a perpetual meat offering; offered not during the days of the anointing, but when it was completed, and it was *wholly burnt*. Fine flour baked as an oil-cake; not a bleeding sacrifice, therefore, but only a thank offering, to denote that expiation was always made, and the high priest offered the fruits of sanctification. This may be viewed—

I. IN ITS TYPICAL APPLICATION TO THE LORD JESUS CHRIST. 1. His *entire consecration* to his mediatorial office. 2. His *personal perfection* as needing no expiation, offering only the fine flour of his unspotted humanity, mingled with the oil of the Spirit of God, and with the fire of actual human experience applied to it. 3. His *acceptance by the Father* on our behalf; “wholly burnt.”

II. IN ITS LESSER APPLICATION TO THE MINISTRY OF THE SANCTUARY. 1. The *true ordination* not a mere human rite, but a Divine acceptance of personal consecration. “I have chosen you,” said Jesus, “and ordained you.” 2. The minister of God should offer his *fine flour*, his highest gifts—his intellect, culture, sifted knowledge, prepared thought. He should put nothing which he himself has not toiled to make worthy on the altar. 3. With all we present, *the oil of grace* must be mingled, and it must be prepared by *actual fire of experience*. No man can teach and minister spiritual blessings to others who is not himself practically acquainted with the truth. 4. “Every meat offering for the priest shall be wholly burnt: it shall not be eaten.” No ministry can be divinely blessed which is not fulfilled in the spirit of single-hearted, self-consuming devotion. We must hate our life for Christ's sake, and take up his cross, if we are to follow him.—R.

Vers. 24—30.—*Special regulations as to the sin offering.* Peculiar sanctity of the flesh and blood of the sin offering, pointing to the atonement. In all cases, whether the sin offering of the people, or of the priest, or of the great day of atonement, the same holiness of the victim and of the blood is insisted upon. Here there is—

I. THE NECESSITY OF ATONEMENT. 1. As prescribed by God, coming forth from his infinite holiness. 2. As connected with mediation, not in atonement dependent upon

the chance merit of man, but the gracious promise of God's free and sovereign mercy. 3. As set forth in the flesh and blood of the victim, clearly indicating a substitutionary merit.

II. THE TYPICAL FULFILMENT OF THE SIN OFFERING IN JESUS CHRIST, at once the High Priest and the Victim. 1. Most holy in his person and his blood. 2. Connected with the burnt offering, as presented in the same place. The cross was a whole offering in the fire of suffering, in the consuming righteousness of the Divine Law. 3. Imparting the holiness to him who shall touch it. Healing virtue from Christ; sanctification from the cross. 4. The very vessels are sanctified. So the Spirit of Christ cleanses the world. The diffusion of the Christian doctrine and life lifts up all that belongs to human existence into a higher sphere.—R.

### EXPOSITION.

#### CHAPTER VII.

CONTINUATION OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL REGULATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRIESTS, RESPECTING THE RITUAL OF THE SACRIFICES. This chapter treats of the ritual of the trespass offering and the peace offerings, as the last chapter treated of that of the burnt offering, the meat offering, and the sin offering. The LXX. version attaches the first ten verses of this chapter to ch. vi., beginning ch. vii. with our ver. 11.

Vers. 1—6.—Further ritual of the trespass offering (see note on ch. v. 14). It is to be noted that the blood of the trespass offering is not to be placed on the horns of the altar, as was the rule in the ordinary sin offering, but cast against the inner side of the altar, as in the burnt offering and peace offering. The rump in ver. 3 should be translated *tait*, as in ch. iii. 9.

Vers. 7—10 contain a general precept or note as to the priests' portion in the sin offering, trespass offering, burnt offering, and meat offering. The officiating priest was to have the flesh of the trespass offering and of the sin offering (except the fat burnt on the altar), and the skin of the burnt offering and the cooked meat offerings (except the *memorial* burnt on the altar), while the meat offerings of flour and of parched grains, which could be kept longer, were to be the property of the priestly body in general, all the sons of Aaron, . . . one as much as another. The skins of the peace offerings were retained by the offerer ('Mishna, Sebach,' 12, 8).

Vers. 11—21.—Further ritual of the peace offering (see note on ch. iii. 1). There are three sorts of peace offerings—thank offerings (vers. 12—15), votive offerings, and voluntary offerings (vers. 16—18). Of these, the thank offerings were made in thankful memorial for past mercies; votive offerings were made in fulfilment of a vow previously taken, that

such offering should be presented if a certain condition were fulfilled. Voluntary offerings differ from votive offerings by not having been previously vowed, and from thank offerings by not having reference to any special mercy received. The thank offering must be eaten by the offerer and his friends, on the same day that it was offered; the votive and the voluntary offerings, which were inferior to the thank offering in sanctity, on the same day or the next. The reason why a longer time was not given probably was that the more the meal was delayed, the less would a religious character be attached to it. The necessity of a quick consumption also took away the temptation of acting grudgingly towards those with whom the feast might be shared, and it likewise precluded the danger of the flesh becoming corrupted. If any of the flesh remained till the third day, it was to be burnt with fire; if eaten on that day, it should not be accepted or imputed unto him that offered, that is, it should not be regarded as a sacrifice of sweet savour to God, but an abomination (literally, *a stench*), and whosoever ate it should bear his iniquity, that is, should be guilty of an offence, requiring, probably, a sin offering to atone for it. The bread gift accompanying the animal sacrifice was to consist of three kinds of unleavened cakes, and one cake of leavened bread, and one out of the whole oblation, that is, one cake of each kind, was to be offered by heaving and then given to the officiating priest, the remaining cakes forming a part of the offerer's festive meal. If any one took part of a feast on a peace offering while in a state of Levitical uncleanness, he was to be cut off from his people, that is, excommunicated, without permission to recover immediate communion by offering a sin offering. St. Paul joined in a votive offering (Acts xxi. 26).

Vers. 22—27.—Repetition of the prohibition of eating the fat and the blood, addressed to the people in the midst of the instructions

to the priests. *Ye shall eat no manner of fat* must be taken to mean none of the fat already specified, that is, the internal fat, and, in the case of the sheep, the tail. It is uncertain whether the law as to fat was regarded as binding upon the Israelites after they had settled in Palestine. Probably it was silently abrogated; but the prohibition of blood was undoubtedly perpetual (Deut. xii. 16), and it is based on a principle which does not apply to the fat (ch. xvii. 11).

Vers. 28—34.—Continuation of the ritual of the peace offerings (see note on ch. iii. 1). The equal dignity of the peace offerings with the other offerings is vindicated by the command that the offerer shall bring it with his own hands, whereas it might have been regarded as merely the constituent part of a feast, and so sent by the hand of a servant. The breast and the right shoulder were to be waved and heaved (for “heaved” does not merely mean “taken off,” as some have said). The waving consisted of the priest placing his hands beneath those of the offerer who held the piece to be waved, and moving them slowly backwards and forwards before the Lord, to and from the altar; the heaving was performed by slowly lifting the pieces heaved upwards and downwards. The movements were made to show that the pieces, though not burnt on the altar, were yet in a special manner conse-

crated to God’s service. *The right shoulder* was most probably the hind leg, perhaps the haunch. The Hebrew word is generally translated “leg” (Deut. xxviii. 35; Ps. cxlvii. 10). This part was the perquisite of the officiating priest; the waved breast was given to the priests’ common stock. Afterwards an addition was made to the priests’ portion (Deut. xviii. 8; see 1 Cor. ix. 13).

Vers. 35, 36.—Conclusion of the section. This is the portion of the anointing of Aaron, and of the anointing of his sons, may be translated simply, *This is the portion of Aaron, and the portion of his sons*, as the word “mischah” will bear the meaning of portion as well as of anointing. This rendering, however, is not necessary, as it was the anointing of Aaron and his sons that entitled them to these portions.

Vers. 37, 38.—Conclusion of Part I. The law of the burnt offering is contained in ch. i. 1—17; vi. 8—13: of the meat offering, in ch. ii. 1—16; vi. 14—23: of the sin offering, in ch. iv. 1—35; v. 1—13; vi. 24—30: of the trespass offering, in ch. v. 14—19; vi. 1—7; vii. 1—6: of the consecrations, in ch. vi. 19—23, supplementing Exod. xxix. 1—37: of the sacrifice of the peace offerings, in ch. iii. 1—17; vii. 11—21; 28—34. Together, the sacrifices teach the lessons of self-surrender, loyalty, atonement, satisfaction, dedication, peace.

### HOMILETICS.

Ver. 13.—Leavened bread was not to be offered on the altar, for a reason before assigned; but, though not offered on the altar, it may yet be consecrated to God, not by burning, but by heaving. Thus there are lives which cannot be wholly devoted to God and his active service, and yet can be consecrated to him. Leavened bread was the bread commonly used, and the secular life of a man engaged daily in the occupations of politics, or of business, or of labour, may be sanctified, and, being sanctified, may be accepted by God as freely and fully as are those directly given up to his especial service.

Ver. 19.—*That which is itself unclean makes whatever it touches unclean also.* So in the moral sphere, “evil communications corrupt good manners” (1 Cor. xv. 33), and “a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump” (1 Cor. v. 6), and so with respect to the spread of heresy, “Their word will eat as doth a canker (or gangrene)” (2 Tim. ii. 17).

On the other hand, that which is itself holy makes that which it touches to be holy (ch. vi. 18). Therefore, when the Holy One was on the earth, “the whole multitude sought to touch him: for there went virtue out of him, and healed them” (Luke vi. 19); and they “brought unto him all that were diseased; and besought him that they might only touch the hem of his garment: and as many as touched were made perfectly whole” (Matt. xiv. 35, 36). Thus the woman with an issue of blood “came behind him, and touched the border of his garment: and immediately her issue of blood stanched. . . . And when the woman saw that she was not hid, she came trembling, and falling down before him, she declared unto him before all the people for what cause she had touched him, and how she was healed immediately” (Luke viii. 44—47).

Hence, when mankind had fallen in Adam, for the restoration of the race a new Head was found in Christ Jesus, into whom each person is baptized, and by a mystical contact with whom he may be sanctified.

Ver. 25.—To eat of the fat of *which men offer an offering made with fire unto the Lord*, is to rob God of his chosen offering. The injunction condemns sacrilege in all its forms. Whoever takes to his own use things dedicated to God, “eats the fat;” and “the soul that eateth it shall be cut off from his people.”

Ver. 34.—The wave breast and the heave shoulder were to be the priests’, as well as the meat offering (ver. 10) and other portions. Thus is taught the lesson enforced by St. Paul (1 Cor. ix. 13, 14), “Do ye not know that they which minister about holy things live of the things of the temple? and they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar? Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel.” The adequate maintenance of the Levitical priesthood was carefully provided for under the old dispensation by means of offerings and of tithes; and “the labourer is worthy of his hire” (Luke x. 7), and “let him that is taught in the Word communicate unto him that teacheth in all good things” (Gal. vi. 6), are principles of the new dispensation likewise.

#### HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

*Ministerial support.* Ch. vii.; cf. 1 Cor. ix. 13; x. 18. We have in this chapter a detailed account of the disposal of the offerings already referred to. The leading idea of the passage is the perquisites of the priests, and the Christian counterpart of this is *ministerial support*. And in this connection let us observe—

I. IN ALL THE OFFERINGS THE FIRST CONCERN WAS TO ALLOCATE TO GOD HIMSELF HIS DUE. In particular he had appropriated to his own use, that is, to manifest atonement, the *blood* of all the sacrifices; and consequently it was never to be eaten, for this would be a profane use of such a sacred thing (vers 26, 27). It is only when we come to the realities out of the types and shadows, that we find Jesus declaring, “Whoso eateth my flesh, and *drinketh my blood*, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed” (John vi. 54, 55). Atoning blood can only be partaken of *by faith*. Moreover, the Lord appropriated the fat—the large amount of suet about the animal—which was absolutely necessary to feed the fire. This was to be devoted, therefore, to this sacred use and withdrawn from all profane use. There were other portions, such as the sheep’s tail, the kidneys, and the caul above the liver, which were burned always on the altar as God’s portion. The general principle, therefore, is plain of first giving unto God his due.

Now, in this particular question of ministerial support, it is with this idea of *stewardship unto God* that we must begin. Men must first realize their obligation to God above before they will do justly by his ministers. The human obligation is best enforced by emphasizing the Divine. If men give God his due, if they are faithful stewards unto him, if they keep zealously the first table of the Law, they will not wrong their neighbours by disregarding the second table; above all, they will not wrong God’s ministers.

II. AFTER GOD’S PORTIONS WERE DEDICATED, THE BEST OF THE RESIDUE BECAME THE PRIESTS’. In some cases the priest got the whole; for example, in a private sin offering or trespass offering, and when, as in the peace offerings, the remainder was shared with the person presenting the sacrifice, the priest’s portion was always the best. The wave breast and the heave leg, the “choice cuts,” as we would now call them, of the carcase, were assigned to the priests. In fact, there is peculiar generosity enjoined in supporting the officers of God.

There is a fashion in a business age of regarding the minister very much as an ecclesiastical tradesman, who is to be dealt with on business principles; that is, as much work is to be got out of him as possible for the minimum of pay. The sooner such poor notions cease, the better for the cause of God. “And we beseech you, brethren,”

says the apostle, “to know them which labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you; and to esteem them very highly in love for their work’s sake” (1 Thess. v. 12, 13). If ministers are rightly regarded, the people will feel it to be their duty, as Israel was instructed to do, to give them the best support they can.

**III. A PROPERLY SUSTAINED PRIESTHOOD WAS IN A POSITION TO EXERCISE FAITHFUL DISCIPLINE IN THE CHURCH.** This ministerial support chapter, as we may properly regard ch. vii., is most particular in debarring the unclean from Church privileges. Whether we are to understand the “cutting off from the people” as death, as the Vulgate appears to do, or as only excommunication, one thing is certain, that the priesthood, assigned its true dignity and supported accordingly, were thereby encouraged to be faithful in the exercise of discipline.

And this relation of proper ministerial support to Church discipline is most important. It is when the office is degraded in men’s minds to a mere profession, and they consequently refuse it adequate support, that they are unwilling to submit to the discipline God’s ministry should wield. To the elevation of the office in the eyes of men, and to the consequent increase of its support, all wise members of the Church of Christ should devote their attention.—R. M. E.

**Vers. 15—18.—*Fidelity to precept enforced.*** The peace offering was essentially a tribute of gratitude and praise. It was especially suited to national festivities and family rejoicings. Cakes and bread accompanied the flesh of the sacrificial animal. Three classes of peace offering are spoken of, viz. for thanksgiving, or for a vow, or as a free-will offering. The flesh must be partaken of by the offerers (the priests having received their portion) and consumed on the first day in the case of the first-mentioned class, and by the close of the second day in the case of the others. The stress laid upon this command may set in clear light the obligatoriness of Divine instructions.

**I. STRICT OBSERVANCE IS DEMANDED, EVEN THOUGH THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PRECEPT BE NOT PERCEIVED.** Little explanation is afforded in the Law of the many ceremonies instituted. The Israelites were treated as children, whose chief virtue is unquestioning obedience. Why should the flesh be so quickly consumed? The devout Israelite might not know, yet must he rigidly conform to the order. He is not to reason, but to do. This course may be recommended to the many who wish a full explanation of the reasons for the institution of the ordinances connected with the Christian Church. Reliance may be placed upon the wisdom of the Divine Legislator, and faith rather than knowledge may glorify God. “The secret things” (the explanations, the reasons) “belong unto the Lord our God; but those things which are revealed” (the facts, the commands) “belong unto us for ever, that we may do all the words of the Law.” That Jesus Christ has ordained Baptism and the Lord’s Supper is sufficient to lead us to practise them, however confused may be our apprehension of the mysteries and principles involved. And in relation to the counsels addressed to us for the guidance of our lives, and the events that are seen to necessitate certain action upon our parts, it may still be said, “What I do thou knowest not now, but thou shalt know hereafter.”

**II. MORE LIGHT MAY BE EXPECTED TO DAWN UPON US CONTINUALLY AS TO THE MEANING OF DIVINE ORDINANCES.** Faith is not intended to exclude or supersede knowledge, but to form a basis for it, an avenue through which it may pass to the mind, an appendix by which its volume may be supplemented. Patient and prayerful study is ever rewarded with keener appreciation of the will of God. If the Israelites reflected for a moment, they would call to mind warnings against desecrating holy things, and against treating what was offered to God as if it were a portion of common food. Surely God would distinguish thus between ordinary slaughter and sacrificial victims, and would guard against that additional risk of putrefaction to which flesh is liable in a hot climate, and which, if it occurred, would be an insult to his majesty. For us at any rate the types and ceremonies of Judaism have been interpreted by Christianity. The Great Prophet has revealed the obscure, and, endowed with his Spirit, apostles have been inspired to comment authoritatively upon the preceding dispensation. And we need not limit our aspirations after an intelligent perception of the meaning of Christian laws. Events as they occur, and reverent, persevering investigation, may unfold to us with increasing clearness the ways of God. But we ought

not to delay observance of his precepts until their design is fully manifest. That servant is slothful who refuses to work by candle-light, and waits for the brightness of the sun.

III. PARTIAL DISOBEDIENCE NEUTRALIZES THE EFFECT OF A RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCE, AND MAY APPEAR MORE OFFENSIVE THAN TOTAL NEGLECT OF THE DIVINE COMMANDS. Let the worshipper trifile with the Law and venture to eat the flesh on the third day, and he shall find to his cost that the whole of his offering is rejected ; it is not pleasing to God, and will not procure him favour. His effort proves useless, it shall not be reckoned to his credit. Worse still, his offering "shall be an abomination" in the eyes of God ; there shall be no grateful odour exhaled, but it shall be a stench in his nostrils. Sin has not been obliterated but augmented by the sacrifice. When the Earl of Oxford would honour King Henry VII. by the presence of a large body of retainers, the king only saw in the men an infraction of the law, and could not consent to have his laws broken in his sight. Honour and dishonour are an ill-assorted pair. The partially obedient worshipper shows himself as knowing God's will and doing it not. Total abstinence might have proclaimed him sinful through ignorance. Half-heartedness is often as productive of evil effects as flat rebellion. It is not for us to presume to say what may be disregarded and what not. To follow the Lord fully is the path of duty and of safety.—S. R. A.

Vera. 29—34.—*The threefold participation.* In the case of the peace offerings, there was a recognition of rights due to God, to his priests, and to the people presenting the victims.

I. THE PORTION RESERVED FOR GOD. The fat parts and the blood were not to be eaten by man ; the former must be burnt upon the altar, the latter poured out at its foot. *There are claims God will not waive.* The homage man owes to his Maker can never be remitted. Full trust and unfaltering obedience can be demanded only by an Infinite Being. *Life must be acknowledged as dependent upon him.* "The blood is the life," and for the Israelite to drink it is to be cut off from the congregation. *The choicest portions belong to God.* He will not put up with inferior parts. They mock him who fancy that a remnant of time and money and strength will suffice for his service.

II. THE SHARE ALLOTTED TO THE PRIESTS. *God takes care of his chosen servants,* provides amply for their wants. The priests devoted wholly to the work of the tabernacle shall not be forgotten, but considered as one with their Master, so that whenever he is honoured they shall be likewise thought of. To wear God's uniform is to be well cared for, to receive good wages, to be sure of a pension. Once taken into his employ, our future comfort is assured. And those who preach the gospel may claim to live by it. See this principle enunciated and inculcated in 1 Cor. ix. 7—14. *Variety is secured.* Food to eat, skins to wear. The atonement of the priest "covered" the sinner, and the covering of the animal was naturally appropriated to the use of the officiating priest. Both flour and flesh fell to the lot of the priests. *The quality shall not be inferior.* Portions are selected, the breast and the shoulder, which were counted as most delicate in flavour and nutritive in substance. Why should God's messengers yield to fear lest they should be neglected ? He feedeth the ravens, clothes the lilies in splendour, and will not forsake those whom he has called to do his work in the world.

III. THE REMAINDER HANDED BACK TO THE PEOPLE. *We have not to do with an avaricious, unreasonable God.* He might justly have claimed the absolute disposal of all brought to his shrine as an offering, but he graciously received a "memorial" for himself and a portion for his ministers, and the rest was returned to the worshippers, consecrated, and for their festal enjoyment. Let us but acknowledge God's requirements, and we shall find that we are not debarred from the innocent pleasures of life, but can enter upon them with sacred enhancing zest. By spending money in the purchase of ointment for the Saviour, Mary did not deprive herself of all her store, but rather increased the satisfaction with which she indulged in the customary household expences. We are sure that the widow who cast her all into the treasury was not allowed to remain utterly destitute. She had really made a profitable investment of her little capital. *Emptying her hands was only preparatory to having them filled.*

*How ennobling the thought of being sharers with God and his servants!* We all partake of the same food, and are made "one bread and one body" (1 Cor. x. 17). There is a better sauce than hunger! It consists in previous dedication to God. Selfish exclusion of the rights of God diminishes the intensity and narrows the sphere of our delights. Not the miser, but the Christian donor, knows the joys of property.—S. R. A.

Vers. 1-8.—*The law of the trespass offering.* This, like the other offerings, was generally considered before (see chs. v. and vi. 1-7). The repetition here, according to Hebrew usage, gives emphasis and solemnity to the injunctions. The subject is reopened to show more particularly the duties and privileges of the priesthood concerning it. And we notice—

I. THAT THE TRESPASS OFFERING IS DESCRIBED AS MOST HOLY. 1. *It was most holy as typifying Christ.* (1) Intrinsically there could be neither sin nor holiness in the animal that was offered up. It was not a moral being. Nor could it be most holy in the sense of removing moral guilt; for it could not do this. For this purpose God never "required" it; never "desired" it (1 Sam. xv. 22; Ps. xl. 6; li. 16; Isa. i. 11; Hos. vi. 6; Heb. x. 1-4). (2) But the guilt offering of Calvary can literally "take sin away," and so accomplish the *will*, the *desire*, and the *requirement* of a just and merciful God (Ps. xl. 6-8; Heb. x. 4-10). Christ is therefore indeed "Most Holy;" and the guilt offering of the Law was so called putatively as typifying him. Accordingly, 2. *It was killed at the north side of the altar.* (1) "It is most holy. In the place where they kill the burnt offering shall they kill the trespass offering" (vers. 1, 2). But the burnt offering was killed at the north side of the altar (ch. i. 11). So was Calvary at the north side of Jerusalem. (2) Because this is given as a reason why the trespass offering was to be accounted "most holy," the Jews have countenance here for their tradition that the less holy sacrifices were slain at the south-west corner of the altar. 3. *It was eaten in the holy place.* (1) "Every male among the priests shall eat thereof: it shall be eaten in the holy place: it is most holy" (ver. 6). This was what the Jews distinguished as "the eating within the curtains," in allusion to the court of the tabernacle, which was enclosed with curtains. (2) In these feastings the priests cultivated fellowship; and the fellowship was religious in proportion as they had the vision of their faith clear to look to the end of the things to be abolished. Faith is the true principle of religious fellowship. (3) The females "among the priests" might eat of the "holy things;" but of the things distinguished as "most holy" they had no right to eat. Since the Fall down to the coming of the "Seed of the woman," a distinction between male and female was maintained, but now it is abolished. God's curse upon the woman has strangely been converted into the greatest blessing to mankind. Even in anger God is love.

II. SUNDRY DIRECTIONS GIVEN TO THE PRIESTS. 1. *With the blood of the guilt offering they were to sprinkle the altar.* (1) The altar was the raised platform upon which the sacrifices were offered up to God. The eminence of Calvary was, more particularly considered, the altar upon which the Great Sacrifice was offered. But in the grander sense, when the great universe is viewed, as Paul views it, as the true temple of God, the earth itself was the altar. The welfare of the universe is concerned in the death of Christ (Eph. i. 10; Phil. ii. 9, 10; Col. i. 20). (2) The sprinkling of the altar with the blood, in this view, would show that the earth, the common inheritance of man, which was cursed for his sake, is redeemed with the price of the precious blood of Jesus. And being redeemed by the *price* of his blood, it is destined also to be redeemed by the *power* of his arm (see Eph. i. 14; iv. 30). What glorious things are in reversion! (3) The Mishna records a tradition thus rendered by Bishop Patrick: "That there was a scarlet line which went round about the altar exactly in the middle, and the blood of the burnt offerings was sprinkled round about *above* the line, but that of the trespass offerings and peace offerings round about *below* it." But these traditions are generally refinements without authority. Let us be thankful for the "sure word of prophecy." 2. *They were to burn the fat upon the altar.* (1) Not the fat intermingled with the flesh. This was not offered upon the altar, except, of course, in the holocaust; nor was it forbidden as food. Had it been so, what embarrassments must tender consciences have suffered! There is nothing unreasonable in the service of God. (2) The fat burnt was chiefly that found in a detached state, viz.

the *omentum*, or *caul*, the fat of the *mesentery* and that about the *kidneys*, with the *rump* or *tail* of the sheep. This last was in the East so enormous that it had in some cases to be supported by a little cart fastened behind the animal (see Ludolf's 'History of Ethiopia,' p. 53). 3. *They had the privilege of claiming the skin* (vers. 7, 8). (1) This privilege probably dates from the days of Eden. Immediately after the Fall, our first parents covered themselves with the leaves of the fig, symbolically to express their sense of shame on account of their sin. In exchange for these, God graciously clothed them with skins, which we may presume were those of animals offered in sacrifice. Here, then, was the robe of an imputed righteousness to cover their sin and shame. (2) If these skins were those of animals offered in sacrifice, then Adam must have acted as a priest, and of course by Divine appointment. As a priest, then he would receive the skins. To this hour those descendants of Adam who act as spiritual priests are those who are invested with the robe of the righteousness of Christ.—J. A. M.

Vers. 9—15.—*The peace offering of thanksgiving.* At the conclusion of the instructions concerning the trespass offering, we have a few directions concerning the meat offering (vers. 9, 10). Whatever of it was dressed was to be given to the priest that offered it, to be consumed by himself and his family. But that "mingled with oil, and dry" was to be divided amongst the sons of Aaron. The reason appears to be economical. What was prepared would not keep, and was therefore to be consumed at once; that which would keep was to be divided, to be used according to convenience. The God of grace is also the God of providence. And his providence is especially concerned for those who seek his grace. After these notes, the law of the sacrifice of the peace offering is formally considered.

I. **THE PEACE OFFERING OF THANKSGIVING.** 1. *There is fitness in this association.* (1) The peace offering has its name, *שְׁלָמִים* (*shelamim*), from *שְׁלָמָה* (*shalem*), to complete or make whole. It was instituted to express the manner in which our breaches of the covenant are made up by Christ. How the variance between God and man is composed through his atoning sacrifice! (2) What, then, more fitting than that we should express our thankfulness to God in connection with the peace offering? Praise breaks spontaneously from the heart that is "reconciled to God through the death of his Son" (see Isa. xii. 1). 2. *A bread offering accompanied this.* (1) One portion of this bread offering was unleavened (ver. 12). This portion was presented upon the altar. As leaven symbolized evil dispositions, no trace of it should be found in anything that touched God's altar (ch. ii. 11). (2) But the other portion was leavened (ver. 13). This portion was eaten by the worshipper, and expressed that he had evil dispositions that needed purging out. What a difference there is between the holy God and sinful man! What a merciful provision is that of the gospel of peace, that reconciles sinners to God!

II. **THE THANKSGIVING IN THE HEAVE OFFERING.** (Vers. 14, 15.) 1. *This was taken from the whole oblation.* (1) The word for *oblation*, *מִשְׁנָה* (*masseuth*), denotes that which is borne or carried, from *נָשָׂה* (*nasa*), to bear or carry. It generally describes anything which was carried to the temple to be offered to God. It also expresses the design of all sacrifices to be the *carrying or bearing* of sin (see Exod. xxviii. 38; also ch. x. 17; xvi. 21). (2) In the offerings of the Law this was *typical*; but in the offering of Christ *real* (see Isa. liii. 4, 12; John i. 29, margin; 1 Pet. ii. 24). (3) From the number of these typical sin-bearers borne to the temple, the heave offering was to be taken. It was a representative of the whole of them, and suggested that what was specifically expressed in it might be predicated of any of them. 2. *It was lifted up in faith and gratitude to God.* (1) The heave offering had its name, *תְּרוּמָה* (*terumah*), from *רָם* (*rum*, to lift up), because it was *lifted up*, viz. toward heaven, by the priest. (2) This action expressed thankfulness to the source whence all blessings come to us, and especially those of redemption. Christ is the "Lord from heaven," the "heavenly gift" of a gracious Father (see John iii. 13, 16, 31; iv. 10; vi. 32, 33; 1 Cor. xv. 47; Heb. vi. 4). 3. *It became the priest's who sprinkled the blood of the peace offering.* (1) Those who make their peace with God through the blood of the cross not only offer thanks, but enjoy the blessings of thanksgiving. Thus a grateful heart is a "continual feast." (2) It was eaten the same day that it was offered. In the very act of thanksgiving to God for his blessings we are blessed. Those who in everything

“give thanks” can “rejoice evermore” (1 Thess. v. 16-18). (3) It was shared by the priest in his own community (see Numb. xviii. 8, 11, 18, 19). Shared domestically. Shared religiously. The stranger had no part nor lot in the matter.—J. A. M.

Vers. 16-27.—*The sanctity of the service of God.* The peace offering may be offered for thanksgiving, in which case it has appropriate ceremonies (vers. 12-15). There is also the peace offering of a vow, the ceremonies of which are the same as those of the voluntary offering (ver. 16; also ch. xix. 5-8). In connection with this subject, we are admonished of the sanctity of the service of God; and similar admonitions are given in what follows.

I. WE SEE THIS SANCTITY IN THE SANCTIONS OF THE LAW OF THE PEACE OFFERING.

1. *Consider the precept.* (1) Look at it in the *letter*. “It shall be eaten the same day that he offereth his sacrifice.” The same day in which the fat is burnt on the altar, the flesh is consumed by the worshipper and his friends. What remains must be eaten on the morrow. If any remain over to the third day, it must not then be eaten, but burnt with fire. (2) The first reason for this is *hygienic*. The flesh would, of course, be wholesome on the day it was killed, and so it would continue to be on the day following. But on the third day, in a hot climate, it would tend to corruption. The laws of health are well considered in the Levitical system, upon which account the study of that system may be commended to the votaries of social science. (3) But there must be a deeper reason still, else the penalties would not be so formidable as they are. The peace offering was undoubtedly a *type of Christ* in his passion (Eph. ii. 13-18). Our Lord was *two days* in the tomb after his death without seeing corruption. Then rising from the dead on the third day, the typical sacrifices of the Law, having answered their end, were abolished. This abolition was foreshadowed in the burning of what remained of the peace offering on the third day (1 Cor. xv. 3). To eat of the typical peace offering on the third day would be therefore highly improper, as it would suggest return to the “beggarly elements” after the “bringing in of the better hope” (Gal. iii. 3; iv. 9-11, 30, 31; v. 1-4). (4) If the “third day” represent the Christian dispensation in which typical sacrifices are done away, how are we to view the “two days” during which they were serviceable? There were exactly two great dispensations before the Christian, in which typical sacrifices were ordained, viz. first, the Patriarchal, from Adam to Moses; and secondly, the Levitical, from Moses to Christ.

2. *Consider the penalties.* (1) If the flesh of the peace offering be eaten on the third day, the sacrifice “shall not be accepted.” The reason will now be obvious. In the third, or gospel, dispensation, there is a better Sacrifice. Typical sacrifices are now out of place and worthless, since the Antitype is come. (2) “It shall not be imputed to him that offereth it.” The typical sacrifices were useful in procuring the “forbearance of God” until the true atonement should be made; but now it is made, Christ will profit *them* nothing who return to the Law. (3) “He shall bear his sin.” He shall be treated as the sacrifice was treated. He shall himself be sacrificed for his own sin.

II. THIS SANCTITY IS FURTHER SEEN IN THE PENALTIES IMPOSED IN OTHER CASES.

Thus: 1. *When the flesh of sacrifice is unlawfully eaten.* (1) This would happen if it had touched “any unclean thing” (ver. 19). Instead of being eaten, it should then be “burnt with fire.” The teaching is that an unclean thing is of no use for purposes of atonement. The sacrifice of Christ could not be accepted were he not immaculate. (2) It would happen if the eater were unclean. “As for the flesh, all that be clean shall eat thereof” (Hebrew, “The flesh of all that is clean shall eat the flesh”), i.e. every clean person shall eat the flesh of his peace offering. As Christ is without spot of sin, so is his flesh meat only to the holy. “But the soul” etc. (vers. 20, 21). To the wicked, the very gospel becomes the savour of death (1 Cor. xi. 29; 2 Cor. ii. 15, 16). 2. *When holy things are profaned.* (1) When the fat is eaten (ver. 23)—the fat of such animals as were offered in sacrifice. There is no law against the eating of the fat of the roebuck or the hart. And that portion of the fat which was offered in sacrifice. The fat mingled with the flesh, which was not burnt on the altar, was not forbidden. There must be the most careful avoidance of whatever would profane the sacrifice of Christ. The fat even of an animal of the sacrificial kind, which by any accident might be rendered unfit for sacrifice, must not be eaten (ver. 24). The moral here is that the very appearance of evil must be avoided. (2) When the blood is eaten. This law is

universal. Blood, *viz.* of every description of animal, is forbidden. The Jews properly expound this law as forbidding the *blood of the life* as distinguished from the *gravy*. And the reason given for the prohibition is that the life maketh atonement for the life. Our life, which is redeemed by the life of Jesus sacrificed for us, must be *wholly* given to God. The highest sanctity is associated with the blood of Christ. (3) "That soul shall be cut off from his people" (vers. 20, 21, 25, 27). The penalty in all these cases is extreme. It means separation from religious and civil privileges, if not also death. The penalties of the Mosaic Law terminated in the death of the body; but "a much sorer punishment" is reserved for those who despise and desecrate the blood of Christ (Heb. x. 28, 29).—J. A. M.

Vers. 28—38.—*The service of the oblation.* In the service of the oblation of the peace offering there are two actors, *viz.* the offerer and the priest. These had their respective duties, which are severally brought under our notice in the text. We have—

I. **THE DUTY OF THE OFFERER.** 1. *He had to bring his oblation unto the Lord.* (1) The "oblation" here is not the "sacrifice," but "of the sacrifice" (vers. 28—30). It was that portion of the sacrifice which, more especially, was claimed by God, *viz.* the fat prescribed to be burnt upon the altar. It included also the breast and right shoulder. (2) This he was to bring in person. "His own hands shall bring the offerings of the Lord made by fire," etc. This requisition is so express that even women, who under other circumstances never entered the court of the priests, did so when they had offerings to bring. The Hebrew name for oblation (*קָרְבָּן*, *korban*) is derived from a root (*קָרַב*, *koreb*) which signifies to approach or draw near. By the introduction of our Great High Priest, we personally, under the gospel, "approach" or "draw nigh" unto God (see Heb. vii. 19; x. 21, 22). We cannot save our souls by proxy. We cannot acceptably serve God by proxy. 2. *He had to bring the fat laid upon the breast.* (1) What our version construes "the fat with the breast" (ver. 30), may be better rendered, as it is by the learned Julius Bate, "the fat upon the breast," *i.e.* laid upon the breast (comp. ch. viii. 28, 27). The breast was that appointed to be waved before the Lord; and it would appear that it was waved with the fat laid upon it. The breast was the natural symbol of *heartiness* and *willingness*. This action would, therefore, express the cheerful and grateful willingness of the offerer, and his earnest desire that his offering might be graciously accepted. What we devote to God should be heartily given (2 Cor. ix. 7). (2) The "heave shoulder" was also brought. This was the right shoulder. It had its name from the ceremony in which it was moved up and down before the Lord. As the "breast" symbolized *affection*, so the "shoulder" expressed *action*, and the "right" shoulder, action of the most *efficient* kind. Love expresses itself in deeds (Matt. xxi. 37—40; Luke vi. 46; Rom. xiii. 9; Gal. v. 14; Jas. ii. 8).

II. **THE DUTY OF THE PRIEST.** 1. *He had to offer up the oblation.* (1) The Mishna says this was done by the priest placing his hands under those of the offerer, upon which the wave breast was laid, and then moving them to and fro. The priest certainly had a hand in the ceremony of waving the breast (see Numb. vi. 20). And if we regard him as a type of Christ in this, then the teaching appears to be that we should look to Jesus to sustain the fervency of our love in the offering of our oblations of prayer and praise and service. (2) The priest in the next place, it appears, offered up the fat in the fire of the altar (ver. 31). Then the right shoulder was "given to the priest for an heave offering" (ver. 32). This, we are told, was moved up and down. Thus these motions of the wave breast and heave shoulder were at right angles, and so they formed the figure of a cross. Houbigant thinks that by this "was adumbrated the cross upon which that Peace Offering of the human race was lifted up, which was prefigured by all the ancient victims" (comp. John xxi. 18, 19; 2 Pet. i. 14; together with the historical tradition concerning the crucifixion of Peter). 2. *The breast and shoulder were then claimed by the priest.* (1) They had these by a Divine ordinance (vers. 31—34). They were first given to God, and now became God's gift to his ministers. What is given to sustain the ministry should not be regarded by the giver as a gratuity, but as a service loyally and faithfully rendered to God (see Numb. xviii. 20—24). Ministers should receive their support as from the hand of God (see 2 Cor. ix. 11; Phil. iv. 18). (2) They had it by a birthright. It was given to "Aaron and

his sons." Those who were not sons of Aaron had no part nor lot in the matter. And true ministers of the gospel must be sons of Jesus; they must be spiritually born, or they are intruders into sacred functions (see Ps. l. 16; Acts i. 25; Rom. i. 5; 1 Tim. i. 12; 2 Tim. iv. 5). (3) They had it also by consecration. The sons of Aaron, though as their birthright were served from the altar, had no title to serve the altar until anointed for that service. So the birth of the Spirit, by which we become sons of Jesus, does not alone constitute ministers. For the ministry they must have a special vocation. Note: "Aaron presented his sons to minister unto the Lord," in which he acted as the type of Christ, who calls and qualifies those he sends. If the harvest be plenteous and the labourers few, the more urgently should we "pray the Lord of the harvest that he would send forth labourers."—J. A. M.

Vers. 1—10.—*Emphatic truths or things God lays stress upon.* The great particularity and the occasional repetition shown in these ordinances point to the truth that God desired his people to attach very great weight to them. His servants were to understand that he laid great stress upon—

I. THE WAY IN WHICH HE WAS APPROACHED IN WORSHIP. Distinctions were drawn between different offerings, the import of which we now find it hard to trace. Though, indeed, it is stated that "as the sin offering so the trespass offering; there is one law for them" (ver. 7), yet there were differences in the way in which the blood was disposed of by the priests, etc. (cf. ver. 2 and ch. iv. 6, 7). Minute details were entered into respecting the disposal of the various parts of the animal (vers. 3, 4, 8). Precise directions were given regarding the eating of the offerings by the priests (vers. 5, 9, 10). It appears to us that there must have been but very faint moral significance in these arrangements to the mind of the Hebrew worshipper. But if this were so, the very particularity of the precepts indicated God's determination that his people should show the utmost vigilance and attention in their approaches to himself. We may wisely learn therefrom that, though our Divine Master has left all details in worship to our spiritual discernment, he is far from indifferent to the way in which we approach him. We should show the utmost care: 1. *To draw nigh to his throne of grace in a right spirit*—a spirit of reverence, trust, expectation, holy joy. 2. *To use those methods of approach which are most likely to foster the true spirit of worship*—having enough of simplicity to favour spirituality of mind; having, at the same time, enough of art and effort to meet the cultivated tastes of all who take part in devotion.

II. THE FACT THAT SIN MEANS DEATH IN HIS SIGHT. The first "law of the trespass offering" (ver. 1) relates to the killing of the animal and the sprinkling of its blood "round about the altar" (ver. 2). The thing in these sacrifices is the application of the blood for atonement: no offering on the altar, no eating of the flesh, until life had been taken, until blood had been shed and sprinkled. The sinner must own his worthiness of death for his trespass, and, if he is to find acceptance, must bring a victim, whose life shall be forfeited instead of his own, whose atoning blood shall make peace with God. This is the foundation truth of Old Testament sacrifices; it is the ground truth of the sacrifice on Calvary.

III. THE TRUTH THAT OUR VERY BEST, OUR OWN SELF, IS TO BE CONSECRATED TO GOD. The best of the slain animals, the vital parts, had to be presented in holy sacrifice on the altar (vers. 3—5). When the atoning blood has brought reconciliation, we are to present our best, our very selves, in acceptable sacrifice to our Saviour.

IV. THE TRUTH THAT ALL WHICH IS PRESENTED TO GOD IS TO BE REGARDED AS HOLY IN HIS SIGHT. Only the priests might eat of the flesh of the offered animal, and they only "in the holy place," for "it is most holy" (ver. 6). Everything became holy when brought to "the door of the tabernacle" and presented to Jehovah. When we dedicate ourselves to his service in the act of self-surrender, we yield everything to him. And then: 1. *Our bodies* become a living sacrifice (Rom. xii. 1; 1 Cor. vi. 13, 20). 2. *Our whole lives* are to be lived and spent before him as holy (1 Cor. x. 31).—C.

Vers. 14, 28—34.—*The kingdom of God: lessons from the heave offering.* The ceremony of the heave offering and wave offering was a striking incident in the rite of the peace offering. "According to Jewish tradition it was performed by laying the parts on the hands of the offerer, and the priest, putting his hands again underneath,

then moving them in a horizontal direction for the waving and in a vertical one for the heaving . . . the waving was peculiarly connected with the breast, which is thence called the wave breast (ver. 34), and the heaving with the shoulder, for this reason called the heave shoulder" (ver. 34). The main truth to which this symbolic act pointed was probably—

I. **GOD'S UNIVERSAL SOVEREIGNTY.** As these parts of the animal were solemnly directed upwards and downwards and laterally, in all directions, the offerer intimated his belief that the realm of Jehovah was a boundless kingdom, reaching to the heavens above, to the dark regions below, to every corner and quarter of the earth. We do well to meditate on the truth thus pictorially presented; but in so doing we are necessarily reminded how much more we have learned both from revelation and human science of the wide reach of his reign. We may think of his Divine kingdom as including: 1. Heaven and all its worlds and inhabitants. 2. Hades—the grave and those who have "gone to the grave." 3. The earth and all that is thereon: (1) all human beings; (2) all unintelligent creatures; (3) all vegetable life; (4) all inanimate treasure—gold, silver, etc. We are reminded of the propriety of—

II. **OUR FORMAL RECOGNITION OF THIS FACT.** The Hebrew worshipper was encouraged to bring his peace offering to the altar, and then to go through this simple but suggestive ceremony, thus formally acknowledging the truth. No similar provision is made for our utterance of it; but it is open to us to declare it in sacred words and in most solemn forms: 1. *In adoration.* "Thine, O Lord, is the greatness and the power . . . for all that is in the heaven and in the earth is thine," etc. (1 Chron. xxix. 10, 11; 1 Tim. i. 17; Deut. x. 14; Ps. xxiv. 1). 2. *In praise.* When we "sing unto the Lord," there should be full and frequent ascription of everything "in the heavens above and the earth beneath" to him as the Author and Owner and Ruler of all. We also see—

III. **OUR APPROPRIATE ACTION THEREUPON.** The Jewish worshipper was directed to "wave" and "heave" the breast and shoulder; these joints in particular and in preference to any other, "probably from their being considered the more excellent parts." When the fat had been burned upon the altar (ver. 31), these joints were reserved "unto Aaron the priest and unto his sons for ever" (ver. 34). We gather therefrom that we are to make practical recognition of the truth that God's kingdom extends everywhere, and includes every one, by: 1. Dedicating our best to his service: *our affections* (suggested by the breast); *our strength* (suggested by the shoulder). 2. Bringing our offerings to his cause—for the support of those who minister in holy things, and for the maintenance of those various agencies which are working for the glory of his Name.—C.

*Vera. 11—18, 30.—Four thoughts on sacred service.* We gather from these words—

I. **THAT THERE IS A JOYOUS AND SOCIAL ELEMENT IN SACRED SERVICE.** There were not only sin and burnt offerings, but also meat and peace offerings, in the Hebrew ritual. Those who were reconciled unto God might rejoice, and might rejoice *together*, before him. They might hold festive gatherings as his servants and as his worshippers; they might eat flesh which had been dedicated to him, and bread, even *leavened* bread (ver. 18), and they were to "rejoice in their feast" (Deut. xvi. 14). The prevailing tone of the true Christian life is that of sacred joy. Even at the remembrance of the Saviour's death humility and faith are to rise into holy joy.

"Around a table, not a tomb,  
He willed our gathering-place should be.  
When going to prepare our home,  
Our Saviour said, 'Remember me.'"

Whether in ordinary worship, or at "the table of the Lord," or in any other Christian festival, we are to "rejoice before the Lord" together.

II. **THAT THERE IS A SPONTANEOUS AS WELL AS A STATUTORY element in sacred service.** "If he offer it for a thanksgiving then he shall offer," etc. (ver. 12). "If the sacrifice . . . be a vow, or a voluntary offering, it shall be eaten," etc. (ver. 16). God's Law says, "*thou shalt*," but it finds room for "*if thou shalt*." There are many things compulsory, and we have nothing to do but cheerfully and unquestioningly obey. There are also many things optional, and we may allow ourselves to act as devotional and

generous impulses may move us. The mind which is constitutionally legal should cultivate the spontaneous in worship and benefaction; the impulsive must remember that there are statutes as well as suggestions in the Word of God.

III. THAT THERE MAY BE NOT ONLY FUTILITY BUT EVEN GUILT in connection with sacred service. Disregard of the prohibition to eat on the third day entirely vitiated the worthiness of the offering: in such case it would "not be accepted," neither "imputed unto him that offered it;" it would be counted "an abomination," and the soul that so acted was to "bear his iniquity" (ver. 18). The service we seek to render God may be: 1. Wholly vitiated so as to be entirely unacceptable, and draw down no blessing from above; or may even be: 2. Positively offensive in the sight of God, and add to our guilt, if it be (1) unwilling, grudging; (2) unspiritual, soulless; (3) slovenly, careless, the offering of our exhaustion instead of our energy; (4) ostentatious or (still worse) hypocritical; (5) much mixed with worldly, or vindictive, or base thoughts.

IV. THAT PERSONAL SPIRITUAL PARTICIPATION IS NECESSARY in sacred service. "His own hands shall bring the offerings" (ver. 30). God would be approached by His people themselves, and though he had graciously granted human mediation in the form of a sacrificing priesthood, yet he desired that every Israelite who had an offering to present should bring it with his own hand to the door of the tabernacle. Religion is a personal thing. We may accept human ministry, but we must come ourselves to God in direct, immediate devotion and dedication. Every man here must bear his own burden (Gal. vi. 5). There is a point beyond which the most ardent affection, the most earnest solicitude, the most burning zeal cannot go—for others. They must, themselves, approach in reverence, bow in penitence, look up in faith, yield in self-surrender, present daily sacrifices of gratitude, obedience, submission.—C.

Vers. 20, 21.—*Divine and human severity.* There is something almost startling in the closing words, "That soul shall be cut off from his people." It suggests thoughts of—

I. APPARENT DIVINE SEVERITY. 1. *That God sometimes seems to be severe in his dealings with men.* These particular injunctions must have had to the Jews an aspect of rigour. An Israelite excommunicated for one of these offences probably felt that he had been hardly dealt with. God's dealings have an occasional aspect of severity (see Rom. xi. 22). So with us. In his providence comparatively slight faults, errors, transgressions, are sometimes followed by most serious evils—disgrace, sorrow, loss, death. 2. *That the light of after-days often explains his dealing with us.* We can see now that the paramount and supreme importance of maintaining the purity of Israel, its separateness from all the abominations of surrounding heathendom, made the most stringent regulations on that subject necessary and wise, and therefore kind. So with us. Looking back on the way by which we have been led, we frequently see that that very thing which at the time was not only distressing but perplexing, was the most signal act of the Divine wisdom and goodness, the providential ordering for which, above every other thing, we now give thanks. 3. *That present faith should rise to the realization that, somewhere in the future, apparent severity will bear the aspect of wise and holy love.* "What we know not now we shall know hereafter." "Then shall we know," etc. (1 Cor. xiii. 12).

II. OCCASIONAL HUMAN SEVERITY. 1. *That we are sometimes obliged to seem severe* towards those for whom we are responsible. (1) The statesman is obliged to introduce a severe measure; (2) a father to take a strong and energetic course; (3) a Church to excommunicate a member. 2. *That apparent severity is sometimes the only rightful course* which wise and holy love can take. It is the action which is (1) due to itself (Jas. iii. 17); (2) due to the object of its affection (1 Tim. i. 20).—C.

Vers. 15—17.—*Three features of acceptable service.* We have commanded or suggested here—

I. CAREFUL PRESERVATION OF PURITY. The "flesh of the sacrifice of his peace offering" was to be eaten on the very day of its presentation (ver. 15); that of another kind of offering might be eaten partly on the day following (ver. 16), but on no account might anything offered in sacrifice be partaken of on the third day (vers. 17, 18). It was one of the objects, probably the primary intention, of this restriction, that nothing

offered to God should be allowed to become unsound. No danger was to be incurred in the way of putrefaction. Another statute in defence of purity in worship! In the service of the Holy One of Israel we must be pure in thought, in word, in act. He is “of purer eyes than to behold evil,” etc. (Hab. i. 13), and can find no pleasure in any service tainted with iniquity. The connection in which this restriction occurs suggests that, especially in those religious engagements in which we find social pleasure, we should be careful to maintain purity of spirit, integrity of heart.

II. CAREFUL RETENTION OF SACREDNESS OF THOUGHT. The partaking of the flesh and the bread which had been presented to God, though these were eaten at home, was to be regarded as a sacred act. It was sacramental. Therefore it was fitting that no great interval of time should come between the act of presentation and the consumption. For the consequence would inevitably be that the sacred festival would tend to sink to the level of an ordinary meal. Sacred thoughts would be less vivid and less frequent; the engagement would become more secular and more simply social as more time intervened. We learn that we should take the greatest care to retain in our mind the sense of the sacredness of religious acts during their performance. When they become mechanical, or wholly bodily, or simply social; when the realization of the religious and the Divine element falls out, then their virtue is gone; they are no longer “an acceptable offering unto the Lord.” We must accomplish this end by: 1. Studious spiritual endeavour to realize what we are doing. 2. By wise precautions, judicious measures, which will tend to preserve sanctity and to guard against secularity of thought.

III. UNSELFISHNESS IN RELIGIOUS SERVICE. The commandment to consume everything within one or two days pointed to an increase in the number of partakers; it suggested the calling together friends and dependents; also the invitation of the poor and needy. This was not only the design but the effect of the injunction (see Deut. xii. 18; xvi. 11). The Israelites, in “eating before the Lord,” showed a generous hospitality while they were engaged in an act of piety and of sacred joy. Let unselfishness be a prominent feature in our religious institutions. It is well to remember: 1. That selfishness is apt to show itself here as elsewhere. 2. That it is never so inconsistent and unsightly as in connection with the service of God. 3. That it is a painful exhibition to the Lord of love. 4. That the more generous and self-forgetting we are in sacred things, the more we approach the spirit and life of our Divine Exemplar (Phil. ii. 4—8).—C.

Vers. 1—10.—The trespass offering, burnt offering, and meat offering, affording support to the minister of the sanctuary and occasion for feasting.

I. It is the intent of true religion that those consecrated to its service should be provided for liberally.

II. Acknowledgment of sin and atonement made lead to rejoicing, and the festival life of man grows out of reconciliation with God.

III. TYPICALLY; Christ the High Priest is rewarded in the sanctification of his people. “He shall see of the travail of his soul, and be satisfied.”—R.

Vers. 11—21.—The peace offerings and thank offerings. The unleavened bread and the leavened bread, both offered. The offerings must be quickly eaten, and all uncleanness must be avoided as iniquity. Thus are taught—

I. THE DUTY OF THANKFULNESS. 1. It should be *cheerful*, glad, pure, speedy. 2. It should be *religious*, expressed towards God as the Author and Giver of every good gift. 3. It should be *social*, recognizing both the house of God and family life.

II. THE NECESSITY OF HOLINESS in all things and at all times. Thanks—vows—voluntary offerings;—in all there must be separation to God, and from the corrupt and unclean. 1. In nothing more need of *vigilance* than in *expressing the heart's more joyful feelings*. Possibility of prolonging the joy till it becomes corrupt. Hilarity over-balancing the soul. Intemperance in enjoyments. 2. *The uncleanness of the world is apt to cling to us*. We should especially watch against carrying the impure spirit into the sanctuary. The mind should be free, the heart calm, the soul hungering and thirsting after spiritual delights, when, on the Lord's day, we enter the courts of his house to offer sacrifice. 3. Fellowship with God's ministers and his services. One voice, but many hearts. True mediation when all alike by faith depending on Christ.—R.

Vers. 22—27.—*Instructions for the people on the fat and on the blood.* The prohibition of fat was to secure the rights of Jehovah from invasion. The fat was a gift sanctified to God. The prohibition of the blood was to keep up the idea of *atonement*, the blood being regarded as the soul of the animal which God had appointed as the medium of atonement for the soul of man. Here is—

I. THE SUPREMACY OF THE DIVINE CLAIMS. 1. The recognition by the conscience in *doctrine*, in the place religion holds in the *life*. 2. *The social state* should be regulated on this principle. Man must not invade God's rights if he would retain God's blessing. Observance of the sabbath. The law of nations rests on the Law of God. 3. The *individual believer* will take care that he robs God of nothing. His service demands the fat, the choicest faculties, the deepest feelings, the largest gifts.

II. THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD MADE THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF MAN. Life for life. The blood sanctified, the blood saved. On the foundation of a perfect reconciliation alone can a true humanity be preserved and developed. Mistake of the ancient Greeks in worshipping *humanity unredeemed*, leading to animalism, and eventually to the substitution of mere art for morality, therefore the degradation of humanity. The elevation of the soul in the elevation of the whole man; “*Im ganzen, guten, schoenen resolut zu leben*,” is a motto only to be adopted in the Christian sense. “He that saveth his life shall lose it;” he that offers it up to God shall redeem it.—R.

Vers. 28—38.—The *wave breast* and the *heave shoulder* given to the priests. God's share and his ministers' share must be both *fully given* and *carefully set aside* and *publicly offered up*. *Generous support of the sanctuary*.

I. SERVICE OF GOD'S HOUSE REQUIRES SPECIAL OFFERINGS; which should be: 1. Large and freely bestowed. Reciprocal blessings; those that give receive, and as they give, they receive. 2. The ministry should be so provided for that the service rendered be joyful and unrestrained. 3. The subordinate arrangements of the sanctuary should partake of the cheerfulness which flows from abundance. A festival of worship.

II. SANCTIFICATION OF GIFTS. Both by personal preparation and by systematic beneficence. Lay aside for God as we are prospered. God's claims should precede all others. The blessing of the sanctuary overflows into common life.

III. PUBLICITY A POWERFUL STIMULUS AND A BINDING PLEDGE. *Waving* and *heaving* represented extent and elevation. Much in example. Our gifts should not be ostentatiously published, but yet, if held up to God, and so presented as to set forth the universality of our consecration to him, they will both glorify his Name and incite others to his service.—R.

## PART II.

## THE INSTITUTION OF AN HEREDITARY PRIESTHOOD.

## EXPOSITION.

## CHAPTER VIII.

THE CONSECRATION OF AARON AND HIS SONS is the natural sequel of the foregoing division of the book. The sacrificial system, which had now been instituted in its completeness, required a priesthood to administer it. Originally the head of each Hebrew family was priest to his own household, to offer gifts betokening self-surrender and communion with God—burnt sacrifices and sacrifices similar in character to the peace offerings. The first step from hence to the hereditary priesthood was the hallowing the firstborn of the Israelites to God's service, after the Israelitish firstborn had been delivered from the destruction which fell upon the firstborn of Egypt (Numb. iii. 13). The second was the substitution of the tribe of Levi for the firstborn (Numb. iii. 41—45), on account of the zeal which the Levites exhibited above the other tribes at the time of the idolatry of the golden calf (Exod. xxxii. 26). Now, out of the tribe of Levi is chosen the one family of Aaron, to form an hereditary priesthood, consisting at first of five persons, quickly reduced to three by the death of Nadab and Abihu. This small body would have been sufficient for the needs of the people while they were still in the wilderness, and leading the life of the camp. With the increase of the nation the family of Aaron and his sons increased likewise, until, in the time of David, it was necessary to subdivide it into twenty-four courses for the orderly fulfilment of the functions of the priesthood. As the institution of the priesthood was necessary for carrying out the sacrificial system, so the sacrifices were necessary for the consecration of the priests. By means of the sacrifices the priests are consecrated, Moses performing on the occasion, and for the last time, the priestly functions. Ap-

pended to the record of their consecration is an account of the first acts of the newly created priests (ch. ix.), and of the death of two of them (ch. x.). This is the only historical section in the book; and the death of the blasphemer (ch. xxiv.) is the only other historical event recorded in it, if at least we except such passages as, "And he did as the Lord commanded Moses" (ch. xvi. 34; xxi. 24; xxiii. 44).

Vers. 1—5.—These verses contain the preliminaries of the ceremony of consecration. Aaron and his sons are to be brought to the door of the tabernacle, together with all that is necessary for the performance of the rite that is about to take place. The words in the second verse, *a bullock for the sin offering, and two rams, and a basket of unleavened bread*, should be translated, *the bullock for the sin offering and the two rams and the basket*. The garments, the anointing oil, the bullock, the two rams, and the basket of unleavened bread and cakes, had all been previously enjoined, when Moses was on the mount (Exod. xxviii., xxix., xxx.). These previous injunctions are referred to in the words, *This is the thing which the Lord commanded to be done* (ver. 5).

Ver. 6.—Washing, robing, anointing, sacrificing, are the four means by the joint operation of which the consecration is effected. The washing, or bathing, took place in the sight of the people. The whole of the person, except so much as was covered by the linen drawers (Exod. xxviii. 42), was washed. The symbolical significance is clear. Cleansing from sin precedes clothing in righteousness and spiritual unction.

Vers. 7—9.—The robing. The various articles of the priestly dress had been appointed and described before (Exod. xxviii., xxix.). In these verses we see the order in which they were put on. After the priests had, no doubt, changed their linen drawers, there came, first, the coat, that is, a close-fitting tunic of white linen, made with sleeves and covering the whole body; next the girdle of the tunic, that

is, a linen sash for tying the tunic round the body, with variegated ends hanging on each side to the ankles; thirdly, the robe, that is, a blue vesture, woven of one piece, with holes for the head and arms to pass through, reaching from the neck to below the knee, the bottom being ornamented with blue, purple, and scarlet pomegranates, alternating with golden bells; fourthly, the ephod, which consisted of two shoulder-pieces, or epaulettes, made of variegated linen and gold thread, fastened together in front and at the back by a narrow strap or band, from which hung, before and behind the wearer, two pieces of cloth confined below by the curious girdle of the ephod, that is, by a sash made of the same material as the ephod itself. Into the ephod were sewn two onyxes, one on each shoulder, in gold filigree settings, one of them engraved with the names of half of the tribes, and the other with the remaining half; and from two rosettes or buttons by the side of these stones depended twisted gold chains for the support of the breastplate. Fifth came the breastplate, which was a square pocket, made of embroidered linen, a span long and a span broad, worn upon the breast and hanging from the gold chains above mentioned, the lower ends of the gold chain being tied to two rings at the upper and outer corner of the breastplate, while the upper and inner corner of the same was attached to the ephod by blue thread running through two sets of rings in the breastplate and ephod respectively. The outer side of the breastplate was stiffened and adorned by twelve precious stones, set in four rows of three, each stone having on it the name of one of the tribes of Israel. The breastplate being double and the two sides and the bottom being sewn up, the pocket formed by it had its opening at the top. Into this pocket were placed the Urim and the Thummim, which were probably two balls of different colours, one of which on being drawn out indicated the approval of God, and the other his disapproval, as to any point on which the high priest consulted him. (The Jewish tradition, that the Divine answer by the Urim and the Thummim came by a supernatural light thrown on certain letters in the names of the tribes, has no foundation.) The last part of the dress to be put on was the mitre, or head-dress of linen, probably of the nature of a turban; to which, by a blue string, was attached the golden plate, in such a way that it rested lengthwise on the forehead, and on this plate or holy crown were inscribed the words, "Holiness to the Lord." The investiture took place as the Lord commanded Moses, that is, in accordance with the instructions given in Exod. xxviii.

Its purpose and its meaning in the eyes of the people would have been twofold: first, after the manner of the king's crown and the judge's robe, it served to manifest the fact that the function of priest was committed to the wearer; and next, it symbolized the necessity of being clothed upon with the righteousness of God, in order to be able to act as interpreter and mediator between God and man, thus foreshadowing the Divine Nature of him who should be the Mediator in antitype.

Ver. 10, 11.—The anointing is still more specifically the means of consecration than the investing or the washing. (For the anointing oil, which is here referred to as a thing well known, see Exod. xxx, 22-25, where its component parts are designated.) The consecration of things as well as of persons is sanctioned by the action of Moses, who anointed the tabernacle and all that was therein, and sanctified them. They were thus set apart for holy purposes. By *all that was therein* would be meant the ark, the vail, the altar of incense, the candlesticks, the table of shew-bread. After the tabernacle and its furniture had been anointed, the altar—that is, the brazen altar—and all his vessels, both the laver and his foot, were sprinkled; not once only, as the things within the tabernacle, but seven times, to show that it was specially holy, although situated only in the court. *The laver*, for the priests' use, was between the door of the tabernacle and the brazen altar of burnt offering. Its *foot*, or base, is described in Exod. xxxviii, 8, as made, according to the translation of the Authorized Version, "of brass, of the looking-glasses of the women assembling, which assembled at the door of the tabernacle."

Ver. 12.—He poured of the anointing oil upon Aaron's head. The change of the verb *poured* for *sprinkled*, indicates that the amount of "the precious ointment" poured "upon the head, that ran down unto the beard, and went down to the skirts of his garments" (Ps. cxxxiii. 2), was far greater than that with which the furniture of the tabernacle had been anointed. The oil sprinkled on the holy things sanctified them as means of grace. The oil poured upon Aaron represents the grace of the Holy Spirit, coming from without, but diffusing itself over and throughout the whole consecrated man.

Ver. 13.—The investiture of Aaron's sons—Nadab, Abihu, Eleazar, Ithamar—follows the consecration of their father. They are robed, according as the Lord commanded Moses in Exod. xxviii. 40, in the white tunic, the sash, and the cap. But there is no statement here of their being anointed, although their anointing is ordered in Exod.

xxviii. 41, and still more imperatively in Exod. xl. 15. They are spoken of as "anointed" in ch. vii. 36, and as having "the anointing oil of the Lord upon them" in ch. x. 7. On the other hand, the high priest is specially designated as "the priest that is anointed" (ch. iv. 3). It is probable that the personal anointing of the ordinary priests was confined to their being sprinkled with oil, as described below in ver. 30; but that they were regarded as virtually anointed in Aaron's anointing. The Levites had no special dress until they obtained permission from Herod Agrippa II. to wear the priestly robes (Joseph. 'Ant.' xx. 9, 6).

Vers. 14—32.—After the bathing, the robing, and the anointing, follow the sacrifices of consecration—the sin offering (vers. 14—17), the burnt offering (vers. 18—21), the peace offering (vers. 22—32).

Ver. 14.—The sin offering. This was the first sin offering ever offered. There had been burnt offerings and sacrifices akin to peace offerings before, but no sin offerings. At once the sin offering takes its place as the first of the three sacrifices before the burnt offerings and peace offerings. Justification comes first, then sanctification, and, following upon them, communion with God. The victim offered by and for Aaron and his sons is a bullock, the same animal that is appointed for the offering of the high priest (ch. iv. 3).

Vers. 15—17.—And Moses took the blood. Moses continues still to act as priest, and the new sacrifice is once offered by him. He performs the priestly act of presenting the blood; but on this occasion, which is special, the blood is not dealt with in the manner prescribed for the high priest's offerings (ch. iv. 6). The reason of this is that Aaron was not yet high priest, and also that the offering was made not only for Aaron, but also for his sons; and further, the blood as well as the anointing oil was required to purify the altar, and sanctify it (see Heb. ix. 21). Although the blood was not "brought into the tabernacle," yet the bullock was burnt with fire without the camp, not eaten according to the rule of ch. vii. 26, 30. This was necessary, as there were as yet no priests to eat it.

Vera. 18—21.—There is no deviation on the present occasion from the ritual appointed for the burnt offering. After the sin offering, righteousness is symbolically imputed to Aaron; after the burnt offering, holiness; then follows the peace offering of the ram, which completes and sacrificially effects the consecration.

Vers. 22—29.—The ram offered as a peace offering is called the ram of consecration, or literally, *of filling*, because one of the means by which the consecration was effected and exhibited was the filling the hands of those presented for consecration with the portion of the sacrifice destined for the altar, which they waved for a wave offering before the Lord, previous to its consumption by the fire. This portion consisted of the internal fat and tail, which was usually burnt (ch. vii. 31), and the heave offering of the right shoulder, or hind leg, which generally went to the officiating priest (ch. vii. 32), and one of each of the unleavened cakes. After this special ceremony of waving, peculiar to the rite of consecration, the usual wave offering (the breast) was waved by Moses and consumed by himself. Ordinarily it was for the priests in general (ch. vii. 31). The blood was poured on the side of the altar, as was done in all peace offerings, but in addition, on the present occasion, it was put upon the tip of the right ear, and upon the thumb of the right hand, and upon the great toe of the right foot of the priests who were being consecrated, symbolizing that their senses and active powers were being devoted to God's service. The same ceremony is to be used in the restoration of the leper (see ch. xiv. 14).

Ver. 30.—The sprinkling with oil and blood completes the ceremony of anointing, and suffices of itself for the sons of Aaron, in addition to their virtual participation in the anointing of their father (ver. 12). "In the mingling of the blood and oil for the anointing seems to be taught that not sacrifice for sin alone suffices; but that with this must be joined the unction of the Holy Spirit" (Gardiner).

Vers. 31, 32.—The flesh of the peace offering is given to Aaron and his sons to eat, not in the capacity of priests (for the peace offerings were not eaten by the priests), but as the offerers of the sacrifice.

Vera. 33—36.—The sacrificial ceremonies were repeated for seven days, during which Aaron and his sons remained in the court of the tabernacle, but did not enter the holy place, abstaining throughout that time from ministering, as the apostles did during the interval between the Ascension and the day of Pentecost. The words, *Ye shall not go out of the door of the tabernacle, should rather be, Ye shall not go away from the entrance of the tabernacle*, and for seven days shall he consecrate you, should rather be, *during seven days ye shall be consecrated*

## HOMILETICS.

Vers. 1-36.—*Priesthood*, which had existed from the beginning of the world, is now for the first time made the exclusive and hereditary function of one family so far as the Israelitish nation is concerned.

I. AARON AND HIS SONS ARE APPOINTED, NOT BY THE NATION, BUT BY GOD. In Exod. xxviii. 1, we read, “And take thou unto thee Aaron thy brother, and his sons with him, from among the children of Israel, that he may minister unto me in the priest’s office.” In ch. viii. 2-5, “Take Aaron and his sons with him. . . . And Moses said unto the congregation, This is the thing which the Lord commanded to be done.” In Numb. xviii. 7, “I have given your priest’s office unto you as a service of gift.” In 1 Sam. ii. 28, “Did I choose him out of all the tribes of Israel to be my priest, to offer upon mine altar, to burn incense, to wear an ephod before me? and did I give unto the house of thy father all the offerings made by fire of the children of Israel?” These texts and the whole tenor of Holy Scripture clearly declare that the appointment of Aaron and his sons to the priesthood was the act of God. On the other side, there is no statement whatever to prove or to indicate that they were, as has been affirmed, merely the delegates of the people, so far as the priestly capacity of the latter is concerned. The only passage alleged to have a bearing in that direction is the following:—“Take the Levites from among the children of Israel, and cleanse them. . . . And thou shalt bring the Levites before the Lord: and the children of Israel shall put their hands upon the Levites” (Numb. viii. 6-10). It is argued that the laying on of hands upon the Levites by the congregation was a delegation of power already existing in the congregation to them. If this were so, still the Levites were not the priests; the act would have been a delegation of the right and function only which the Levites possessed—and these were not priestly functions, but the office of waiting upon the service of the tabernacle. But the laying on of hands, in itself, means no more than setting apart, and, in the case of the Levite, we are told that its special meaning was setting apart as an offering or sacrifice. “And Aaron shall offer the Levites before the Lord for an offering of the children of Israel, that they may execute the service of the Lord. . . . And Aaron offered them as an offering before the Lord; and Aaron made an atonement for them to cleanse them. . . . And after that went the Levites in to do their service in the tabernacle of the congregation before Aaron, and before his sons: as the Lord had commanded Moses concerning the Levites, so did they unto them” (Numb. viii. 11-22). The consecration of the priests was entirely distinct from the dedication of the Levites, and had taken place previously to it. The priest was the minister of God; the Levite was the minister of the priest. None can make a priest of God but God himself.

II. QUALIFICATIONS FOR THE PRIESTHOOD. 1. Aaronic descent (see Exod. xxviii.; ch. viii.; 2 Chron. xxxi. 17-19; Ezra ii. 62; Neh. vii. 64). 2. Physical integrity and freedom from blemish. “No man that hath a blemish of the seed of Aaron the priest shall come nigh to offer the offerings of the Lord made by fire: he hath a blemish; he shall not come nigh to offer the bread of his God. He shall eat the bread of his God, both of the most holy, and of the holy. Only he shall not go in unto the veil, nor come nigh unto the altar, because he hath a blemish; that he profane not my sanctuaries” (ch. xxi. 21-23). 3. Respectable marriage (ch. xxi. 7); in the case of the high priest, marriage with one previously unmarried, “in her virginity” (ch. xxi. 13). The two last qualifications symbolize the integrity of heart and purity of life and surroundings which are requisite in the minister of God. Further, at the time of his ministrations, the priest must be free from any ceremonial uncleanness (ch. xxii. 3, 4), and must abstain from wine (ch. x. 8, 10), the purity and collectedness demanded of God’s minister at all times being specially required while he is officiating.

III. WHEREIN THE PRIEST’S OFFICE CONSISTED. 1. It consisted in “offering gifts and sacrifices for sins” (Heb. v. 1), this expression including all kinds of offerings and sacrifices by which men drew near to God, together with the burning of incense symbolical of prayer. The priest’s action was necessary for the offering of the sacrificial blood and burning the flesh upon the altar, and in some cases for consuming a portion of the victims

themselves. 2. It consisted in bestowing benedictions (see Numb. vi. 23—27, “Speak unto Aaron and unto his sons, saying, On this wise ye shall bless the children of Israel. . . . And they shall put my Name upon the children of Israel ; and I will bless them ”). 3. It consisted in mediating between God and man, as in the rebellion of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, when “ Moses said unto Aaron, Take a censer, and put fire therein from off the altar, and put on incense, and go quickly unto the congregation, and make an atonement for them : for there is wrath gone out from the Lord ; the plague is begun. And Aaron took as Moses commanded, and ran into the midst of the congregation ; and, behold, the plague was begun among the people : and he put on incense, and made an atonement for the people. And he stood between the dead and the living ; and the plague was stayed ” (Numb. xvi. 46—48). 4. It consisted in their being the teachers of the people, “ That ye may teach the children of Israel all the statutes which the Lord hath spoken unto them by the hand of Moses ” (ch. x. 11). “ They shall teach Jacob thy judgments, and Israel thy Law ” (Deut. xxxiii. 10). “ For the priest’s lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the Law at his mouth ” (Mal. ii. 7). Besides being teachers, they were judges of differences, “ By their word shall every controversy and every stroke be tried ” (Deut. xxi. 5 ; see Deut. xvii. 8—12 ; 2 Chron. xix. 8—10). They were also leaders of the people’s devotions : “ Let the priests, the ministers of the Lord, weep between the porch and the altar, and let them say, Spare thy people, O Lord, and give not thine heritage to reproach, that the heathen should rule over them : wherefore should they say among the people, Where is their God ? ” (Joel ii. 17). 5. In addition, “ to the priests belonged the care of the sanctuary and sacred utensils, the preservation of the fire on the brazen altar, the burning of incense on the golden altar, the dressing and lighting of the lamps of the golden candlestick, the charge of the shew-bread and other like duties. They were necessarily concerned in all those multitudinous acts of the Israelites which were connected with sacrifices, such as the accomplishment of the Nazarite vow, the ordeal of jealousy, the expiation of an unknown murder, the determination of the unclean and of the cleansed leprous persons, garments, and houses ; the regulation of the calendar, the valuation of devoted property which was to be redeemed ; —these and a multitude of other duties followed naturally from their priestly office. They were also to blow the silver trumpets on various occasions of their use, and, in connection with this, to exhort the soldiers about to engage in battle to boldness, because they went to fight under the Lord ” (Gardiner).

IV. THE EXERCISE OF THE PRIEST’S ESSENTIAL FUNCTIONS WAS CONFINED EXCLUSIVELY TO THEIR ORDER. It has been argued that the office of performing sacrifice was shared by (1) the Jewish monarchs, (2) the rulers, (3) the Levites, (4) the people in general. 1. The first hypothesis has been supported by an appeal to the following passages :—Solomon “ came to Jerusalem, and stood before the ark of the covenant of the Lord, and offered up burnt offerings, and offered peace offerings, and made a feast to all his servants ” (1 Kings iii. 15) ; “ And the king, and all Israel with him, offered sacrifice before the Lord. And Solomon offered a sacrifice of peace offerings, which he offered unto the Lord ” (1 Kings viii. 62, 63). They do not, however, mean more than that Solomon presented the offerings for sacrifice, the essential part of which ceremony was no doubt performed, as always, by priests. Saul, indeed, sacrificed at Gilgal, on plea of necessity, but, in spite of even that plea, was reproved by Samuel as having “ done foolishly ” (1 Sam. xiii. 13) ; and Uzziah “ went into the temple of the Lord to burn incense upon the altar of incense ; ” but Azariah the priest “ withheld Uzziah the king, and said unto him, It appertaineth not unto thee, Uzziah, to burn incense unto the Lord, but to the priests the sons of Aaron, that are consecrated to burn incense : go out of the sanctuary ; for thou hast trespassed ; neither shall it be for thine honour from the Lord God. . . . And the leprosy even rose up in his forehead before the priests in the house of the Lord ” (2 Chron. xxvi. 16—20). These cases disprove the priestly power of the monarch. 2. The supposition that the nobles could perform priestly acts rests upon the fact that the name *cohen* is sometimes applied to them (2 Sam. viii. 18 ; 1 Kings iv. 2, 5) ; but the word (the derivation of which is doubtful) appears to have a wider usage than that of “ priest, ” and to mean also “ officers ” (cf. 1 Chron. xviii. 17). 3. The destruction of the company of Korah, because, being Levites, they “ sought the priesthood also ” (Numb. xvi. 10), disposes of the priestly rights of the tribe of Levi. 4. And the swallowing up of Dathan and Abiram, whose sin was that

of desiring to equalize themselves with the family of Aaron, on the plea that the latter "took too much upon them, seeing that all the congregation were holy, every one of them" (Numb. xvi. 3), disproves the right of all the congregation to exercise priestly function, however much they might be, in a sense, a nation of priests. According to the Mosaic legislation, the spirituality and temporality were kept apart, nor were they united, except when royal powers came, in the later days of the nation's history, to be attached to the office of high priest—a course which a considerable section of the Christian Church attempted, with less excuse, to follow in mediæval and subsequent times, when the principle, "My kingdom is not of this world" (John xix. 36) became obscured or forgotten.

V. THE CEREMONIES OF THE CONSECRATION. 1. Bathing, robing, anointing, signifying cleansing, justifying, sanctifying. 2. Sacrifices in their behalf—sin offerings, burnt offerings, peace offerings, symbolizing their reconciliation with God, the surrender of themselves to him, and their peace with him. 3. Watching for seven days in the tabernacle court, each day renewing the sacrifices; giving opportunity for self-recollement, and for devoting themselves heart and soul to him whose special servants they were to be.

VI. THE AARONIC PRIESTHOOD WAS A TYPE OF THE PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST. The type was accomplished in the Antitype, and the Levitical priesthood is now wholly abolished (see Heb. vii. and viii.).

VII. LIKENESS YET CONTRAST OF THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY. We learn from Eph. iv. 8, 11, 12, that on Christ's ascension into heaven, he received of his Father the gifts of the holy Ghost, which he then bestowed upon his Church, to be administered and dispensed by apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers; the grace of government being ministered by apostles, and, after they had died out, by bishops; the grace of exposition by prophets; the grace of conversion by evangelists; the grace of edification by pastors and teachers, or presbyters. We should note here the superiority of the Christian to the Jewish ministry, the functions of offering sacrifice and of mediating between God and man being far inferior to that of being the dispensers to man of the gifts of the Holy Ghost himself; and the error of any who think to dignify and elevate the character of the Christian ministry by assimilating it to the Jewish.

VIII. THE NEED OF AN OUTWARD CALL IN BOTH CASES. "No man taketh this honour unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron" (Heb. v. 4); so that even Christ waited to be "called of God" before commencing his ministry. The outward sign of Aaron's having been called of God was his anointing, and the other ceremonies of initiation; and every subsequent high priest had to be anointed and initiated in the same manner as Aaron, and by the same forms, before he was regarded, and before he could become, high priest. The outward sign of the call in the Christian ministry is the laying on of hands. So it was in the case of the seven deacons (Acts vi. 6), and in St. Paul's case (Acts xiii. 3), and in that of Timothy (1 Tim. iv. 14). And all subsequent ministers of Christ have to be appointed in like manner by those "who have publick authority given unto them in the Congregation, to call and send Ministers into the Lord's vineyard" (Art. XXIII.).

IX. ALL CHRISTIANS ARE A ROYAL PRIESTHOOD (1 Pet. ii. 9). As the Israelites were a kingdom of priests (Exod. xix. 5), so too are Christians consecrated to God in baptism, channels of grace to each other, and therefore each in a special manner his brother's keeper. Practical duties thence flowing—brotherly affection, loving-kindness, care for the souls of others, tenderness to the weak.

#### HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

*Priestly consecration.* Ch. viii.; cf. Luke iii. 21, 22; Heb. iv. 14—16; v.; vii.; viii.; ix.; 1 Pet. ii. 4, 5, 9. In this chapter we have the history of the consecration of the Aaronic priesthood. The stages were briefly these:—Lustration, or, as we would now say, *baptism*; investiture; anointing; atonement; dedication; consecration; and, finally, communion. The mediation and ministry of this priesthood were essentially *dramatic* in character, hence it took a long time to present, in the dramatic form, the various ideas which have been just set down as the stages of consecration. Not only so, but

they were emphasized by a sevenfold repetition; for seven days the process was to be repeated, at the end of which time Aaron and his sons were regarded as duly set apart for their work. Let us, then, compare the consecration of the high priests with the consecration of the immortal High Priest, Jesus Christ; and, secondly, the consecration of the minor priests with the consecration of believers, who are, as the passage cited from 1 Peter shows, "priests unto God."

I. THE CONSECRATION OF AARON COMPARED WITH THE CONSECRATION OF CHRIST. Now we have in this comparison, first a *contrast*, and then a *parallel*. It will be useful to take these up in this order—

1. *The elements of contrast in the consecrations.* And here we notice: (1) That Aaron's consecration implies his *infirmitas* and *sinfulness*, whereas *Christ never assumed the penitential position*. The baptism of Jesus Christ (Luke iii. 21, 22) is the historical counterpart of Aaron's consecration. And although John's baptism was unto repentance, we know our Lord took up the sinless position even unto the end, challenging all comers to convince him of sin (John viii. 46). We shall see presently what his acceptance of John's baptism signified. One thing meanwhile is clear, that he professed to be "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners." Now, in this respect he was a complete contrast to Aaron. Aaron, in the consecration, takes up the penitential position. He has to be typically washed and sprinkled with blood. (2) Aaron's consecration implied a *temporary high priesthood, while Jesus is set apart to an everlasting priesthood*. The association of Aaron's sons with him in the priesthood indicated plainly that death would sooner or later necessitate a successor. Moreover, there are sundry indications in the regulations about the successors. It was, therefore, only a temporary office. "They were not suffered to continue by reason of death." But Jesus was set apart to an everlasting office. "This man, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood" (Heb. vii. 24—28). So much briefly about the contrast.

2. *The parallel in the consecrations.* And here we have to notice: (1) *Both Aaron and Christ are formally set apart.* What Moses did for Aaron, John the Baptist did for Christ. Not, of course, that our Lord's priesthood had an existence only after his baptism; we merely mean that the baptism in the Jordan was the formality with which his ministry began, and corresponded to the consecration of Aaron by Moses. The crowd at the tabernacle door to witness Aaron's consecration corresponded to the crowd of candidates at the Jordan who witnessed the baptism of Jesus, though its significance and singularity they did not appreciate. (2) *Both Aaron and Christ willingly dedicated themselves to their work.* We have already noticed how Aaron needed a cleansing by water and blood, which Jesus did not. The sin offering is what Jesus provided for others, not what he requires for himself. But when we enter this caveat about the different relations of the two persons towards *atonement*, we are in a position to appreciate the parallel between them in personal dedication. This was what Aaron's *burnt offering* implied. He offered himself willingly for the priestly work. And the same dedication of self we find in the baptism of Jesus. He claimed baptism after all the people (*πάντα τοις λαοῖς*) were baptized (Luke iii. 21), in other words, after the movement inaugurated by John had become *national*. John did not at first understand why a sinless One like Jesus should demand baptism from one who was sinful. But Jesus quieted his fears by the assurance, "Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness" (Matt. iii. 15). The meaning of the act on Christ's part can only have been that he dedicated himself to the fulfilment of all that was needed to realize the national hope. Now, the national repentance was in hope of *pardon*, and so Jesus' dedication at the Jordan was to death and to all that his priesthood implies, that the people may have their place as pardoned and accepted ones in the kingdom of God (cf. Godet upon Luke iii. 21, 22; also his 'Etudes Biblique,' tom. ii. p. 105). This dedication of Jesus at the Jordan was the spirit of his ministry, and above all of his death. It is this he refers to in the momentous words, "For their sakes I sanctify (*καθιδίω*) myself, that they also may be sanctified through the truth" (John xvii. 19). (3) *Both Aaron and Jesus received certain blessings from God in response to their self-dedication.* The gracious gifts of God to his high priests may for brevity's sake be summed up into three. (a) The gift of *REVELATION*, to enable them to understand their office, and faithfully to fulfil it. This is presented in the *investiture* of Aaron,

especially in the arrangement about the *Urim and Thummim*. The beautiful garments and this mysterious portion which lay upon the high priest's bosom were to convey certain ideas about the office, and to secure in him the *oracular* man (cf. Ewald's 'Antiquities of Israel,' pp. 288-98). Now, in the baptism of Christ, as he was praying with uplifted eye, he saw "heaven opened;" that is, the source of light, the fountain of all knowledge, was opened to him. In other words, he obtained and had continued to him a full revelation of all which he needed for his work. (b) The gift of **UNCNTR** or **INSPIRATION**, to enable them to interpret the revelation already guaranteed. This was indicated by the anointing of Aaron, not only on the head, but on the ear, hand, and foot. In this way the needful inspiration was symbolized, and the ritual of the ram of consecration coincided therewith. In Christ's case the perfect inspiration was symbolized by the *descent of the dove*. The dove being an organic whole, a totality, indicates that to Jesus there was communicated the entirety of the Holy Spirit, for the purposes of his priesthood. "The Holy Spirit was not given by measure unto him," and "out of his fulness do all we receive, and grace for grace" (John iii. 34; i. 16). (c) The gift of **COMMUNION AND ABIDING**. Aaron, after the ritual of the sin offering, burnt offering, and consecration offering was over, and the best portions had been laid upon God's altar, was called to communion in the feast at the door of the tabernacle. There he was to abide in the enjoyment of fellowship with God, and in this spirit was to do all his work. And the assurance of sonship which Christ received in baptism corresponded to this. The words of the Father, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased;" and "Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased" (Matt. iii. 17; Luke iii. 22), spoken respectively to John and to Jesus, convey the state of sweet assurance of sonship in which our Lord lived all his life. It was this supported him when he foresaw the dispersion of the disciples, "Behold, the hour cometh, yea, is now come, that ye shall be scattered, every man to his own, and shall leave me alone: and yet I am not alone, because the Father is with me" (John xvi. 32). The Great High Priest performed his mediatorial work in an assurance of sonship and in the enjoyment of fellowship. It was only in the climax of his sufferings on the cross, when the desolation came upon him, that for a season he seemed to lose sight of his sonship, and was constrained to cry, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"

## II. THE CONSECRATION OF THE MINOR PRIESTS COMPARED WITH THE CONSECRATION OF BELIEVERA. Now here we have to notice—

1. *That the sons of Aaron were consecrated along with Aaron.* It was one consecration. Although the high priest received special anointing, and was chief of the group, the others shared his consecration. The one oil and the one consecrating blood went upon all. The one burnt offering was presented on behalf of all, and they all partook of the one feast and fellowship at last. And is this not to indicate that all believers share in the consecration of Jesus, their Great High Priest? It is the Spirit of Christ and the mind of Christ which is made over to them. He is the reservoir, and out of his fulness all the minor receptacles receive.

2. *This fellowship in consecration was with a view to fellowship in service.* The priestly service was so arranged that all had a share in it. There were, of course, services in connection with atonement which only the high priest could perform, but there was ample work about the tabernacle for all the minor priests. In the same way the life of believers is to be a consecrated fellowship with Christ in work. "Fellow-workers with God" is the great honour of the religious life. A Divine partnership is what we are asked to enter upon. And this is the greatest honour within the reach of man.—R. M. E.

**Vera. 4, 5.—The installation of Aaron.** The origin of any order of men is traced with interest, and the account given of the appointment of a special class to wait upon the Lord in the service of his sanctuary cannot be read without profit.

I. **THE ASSEMBLING OF THE PEOPLE TO WITNESS THE INSTALLATION.** 1. *It deeply concerned them; the office was created for their benefit.* We may witness the investiture of a knight of the Garter, and deem it a gorgeous scene, but one bearing no practical relationship to us. Not so with the coronation of our prince or the ordination of our pastor. By the mediation of the priests the Israelites were to find acceptance with God. And Jesus Christ has been inducted into his lofty position for the advantage

of his people. Why, then, turn away and refuse to enjoy this best of privileges? He waits to intercede on our behalf. It is no idle ceremony that the Word of God records, but one having to do with our daily sins, fears, trials, troubles, joys, and blessings. The titles and qualifications of Jesus Christ are of vital moment to our welfare. 2. *It was designed to impress them with a sense of the dignity and authority of the priesthood, and of the need of holiness in order to have access unto God.* How important the functions to be fulfilled by men who are thus solemnly prepared for their efficient discharge! And how august the Being who could demand such qualifications in those devoted to his service! No careful student of the Gospel narratives but must be struck with the manner in which Jesus Christ was fitted for his office, "perfected" by his obedience, made a "a merciful and faithful High Priest" by his humiliation, and with "the blood of his cross" making reconciliation with God. 3. *The presence and tacit concurrence of the people signified a willingness to obey the priests, to honour and support them.* They were made parties to the transaction, and acquiesced in its significance. It were well that the meaning of our presence at various meetings were better realized, and that we did more fully redeem the pledges thus implicitly given. God would have all his people enter into contracts with a clear understanding. To secure a compact by concealment of the obligations imposed is no part of his plan of procedure.

II. **THE DECLARATION OF MOSES;** "This is the thing which the Lord commanded to be done: 1. *Reminds us of the caution to be exercised lest human devices should be thrust forward in religious notions or practices.* Men are ready to formulate their own ideas, and to make them ordinances of God's house or kingdom. Ready, too, to renounce what has been instituted, to abolish observances as unnecessary, or to relegate certain attitudes of the Spirit to heathenism and infancy, to make light of sin and of the need of a high priest or a sacrifice. 2. *A Divine call is requisite to the undertaking of religious functions.* Moses acted as the representative of Jehovah, empowered to consecrate Aaron and his sons. "So also Christ glorified not himself to be made a high priest, but he that said unto him," etc. 3. *Contained an intimation that he who appointed could also dismiss the Aaronic priesthood.* The legislator has power to revoke his edicts. It was God who caused the order of Aaron to be succeeded by the order of Melchizedek. 4. *Indicates the intrinsic superiority of the prophetic to the priestly office.* Moses institutes Aaron, the prophet consecrates the priest. Priesthood is remedial, adapted to a peculiar constitution of things. It is a sort of interregnum that is finally to pass away when "the Son shall have delivered up the kingdom to God the Father." It is connected with sin, and sin is being destroyed. Before Adam fell, he received communications from God; the prophetic revelation preceded the priestly sacrifices. The subordination of the priests is often evinced in the Hebrew records, where the denunciations of the prophets show that the priestly ceremonies were intended to be subservient to, not exclusive of, moral sentiments and duties.—S. R. A.

**Vers. 6—12.—The High Priesthood of Christ.** To direct the thoughts of a congregation to Jesus Christ is never unseasonable. The Epistle to the Hebrews warrants the assumption that in the rites here described are symbolized the characteristics of our Great High Priest. The consecration consists of two parts—the anointing and clothing of the person of Aaron, and his offering of sacrifices; and it is on the former we are now to dwell, reminding us of that Person in whom "all beauties shine, all wonders meet, all glories dwell."

I. See typified **THE PURITY OF CHRIST** in the washing of the priest from head to foot. As an Eastern climate demands thorough ablution for cleanliness, so was this a lesson man needed to learn, that only purity is fit to come into contact with God. Priesthood bridged the gulf between sinful man and a Being unsullied by admixture of evil. Like all God's dealings, it humbled and exalted man. Taught plainly that he was too polluted to approach his Maker, with equal distinctness he was shown a way in which he might draw near with clean hands and a pure heart. The material and ceremonial purity of Aaron was eclipsed by the total freedom from taint of Christ. He bathed, indeed, in the crystal waters of Jordan at his entrance upon his public ministry, but those waters were stained compared with the purity of his soul.

II. Observe **THE SPLENDOUR OF HIS ENDOWMENTS.** For every post a certain cha-

racter is requisite. The putting on of garments represented the bestowment upon Aaron of the qualities essential to the proper discharge of his duties. This was the apparel respecting which the Lord said unto Moses, "Thou shalt make holy garments for Aaron thy brother, for glory and for beauty." Looking at the high priest thus arrayed, we see symbols of the ornaments and graces of Jesus Christ. Note the choice quality of the attire. Everything of the best, fine linen, gold unalloyed, stones precious and rare. The oil is "costly ointment." Search out all that is best in human nature, all that challenges admiration and excites esteem, and an example of all is found in Jesus Christ. Possessed of every gift, power, and skill, loveliness and majesty, perfect in intellect, emotion, and will, he was victorious over every temptation, and unscathed by every trial. This dress of Aaron emblematised positive virtue; so Christ was upright, not only like Adam as he left the hands of God, but as acquiring and exhibiting every grace that can adorn humanity. There was virtue in exercise, virtue visible and potent. The tree put forth its leaves, its blossoms, and its fruit.

III. The high priest maintained **A CONSTANT REMEMBRANCE OF THE PEOPLE**. Hence the breast-plate bearing the names of the twelve tribes, which were also inscribed upon the onyx stones of the shoulder. The people were borne in the positions that indicated power and sympathy. What the bosom desires the arms accomplish. Let others write their names upon lofty pillars or granite rocks; let statesmen, warriors, nobles, inscribe themselves upon the roll of fame; "Give me," says the Christian, "a place upon the Saviour's breast; for there on the heart of Christ, under the glance of infinite mercy, where the love of God delights to rest, are the names of all his followers graven for ever."

IV. In the breast-plate were put the Urim and Thummim, by means of which was ascertained and made known the will of God. **REVELATION OR GOD** was thus part of the high priest's functions. The priestly and prophetic offices were intertwined. Though we may single out an office of Christ for distinct consideration, as we may distinguish one of the hues of the rainbow, yet let us not forget that it is the combination which is of such surpassing excellence and glory. It has been well said that Christ is called the Wisdom of God in the Old Testament, and the Word in the New. Full vocal expression was reserved for the time when he could joy to say, "I have declared unto them thy Name, and will declare it." It is by the priesthood of Christ that we learn in particular the grace of God. It is written on all creation, but to our blurred vision the letters are oft obscure. On the cross of Christ, where he becomes at once the Offerer and Victim, these words glisten with heavenly radiance, luminous not only in noontide prosperity, but in the dark midnight of affliction, "God is love."

V. The high priesthood is **AN OFFICE OF AUTHORITY**, and this authority is **THE SUPREMACY OF HOLINESS**. Upon the head is placed the mitre, a cap or turban, and upon the mitre is fastened a golden plate or diadem, inscribed "Holiness unto the Lord." Christ's is a royal priesthood, and his sway is the result of his consecration to God. He rules by right of character, by right of rank, by right of work. The "holy crown" is the guarantee for the acknowledgment of his claims to hearty, unreserved obedience. If to-day men demand authority as priests, at least let the holiness of their lives support their pretensions.

VI. By the pouring of the oil upon Aaron's head we see intimated **ENTIRE DEDICATION TO GOD'S SERVICE**. This holy unction set apart the high priest for hallowed toil, and became an emblem of the fortifying, sustaining, vitalizing presence of the Spirit of God. "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because he hath anointed me." It is the oil of gladness, the dew of the blessing of the Lord. It is a token of perpetuity. The brightest pageant fades, the show of to-day is forgotten ere the morrow dawns, but the priesthood of Christ knows neither ebb nor flow.—S. R. A.

Vers. 14-30.—*The triple offering.* Under the Christian dispensation only two classes of priests remain—the real High Priest, Jesus Christ, and his people who are figurative priests offering up spiritual sacrifices. The ceremonies described in this chapter may throw light upon our position and duties as the followers of Christ, and remind us of the superiority of Christ to Aaron.

I. **OUR BESEMBLANCE TO AARON IN THE TRIPLE OFFERING WE ARE REQUIRED TO**

**MAKE.** 1. The sin offering. Priesthood commences by *self-abnegation*, the confession of sin and renunciation of personal merit. By this offering the altar is sanctified (ver. 15), on which afterwards all other gifts will in due course be laid. Until the Saviour has been recognized as made a curse for us, there is no foundation for the life that will please God. The house must be cleansed ere its worthiest inhabitant will condescend to enter. 2. The burnt offering. Here the positive side begins, of *devotion to God*. The parts of the ram are placed upon the purified altar, and the flames emit an odour fragrant to God. The man who has confessed his unworthiness and pleaded the merits of Jesus Christ, dedicates himself to him who died for him. He is not his own, and must henceforth glorify God. "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" is his cry. 3. The consecration offering. This results from the others, and is their natural completion by bringing full hands (consecration equals "fulness" in original) to God. *Entire dedication and consequent communion with God* its signification. The blood of the ram is sprinkled upon the ear, that it may hearken to the commands of God, and, whilst attentive unto him, disregard the whispers of evil. Also upon the right hand, that all its acts may be in conformity with righteousness, the might of the man going forth in holy deeds. And upon the right foot, that its steps may be ordered by the Lord and its owner may ever tread the ways of obedience and sanctification. Every faculty is enlisted in the service of God. By the wave and heave offerings and the presentation of cakes we learn the necessity of looking upon all our property and all that supports life as belonging to God, who must have his special share and be glorified thereby as well as by our joyful use of the remainder. To fill the hands for God is to complete our consecration, and to live upon heavenly food in the enjoyment of his blessing. By giving to him we get for ourselves.

**II. THE SUPERIORITY OF CHRIST TO AARON.** 1. *His consecration was total, whilst Aaron's was but partial.* There were many periods when the high priest was seeing to his own peculiar wants and offering for his own especial infirmities. The whole career of Jesus Christ was an offering for others, originated and executed for the good of man and the glory of his Father. He "came not to do his own will." Aaron might lay aside his robes of office and take his repose, but the Son of man was ever clothed with his official character. And this is still clearer when we remember the present position of our High Priest and his unceasing, uninterrupted intercession. 2. *The holiness of Aaron was ceremonial and symbolical, that of Christ is literal and real.* Jesus was on earth holy, harmless, undefiled. The searching eye of God can discern in his righteousness no stain nor flaw. So far was Aaron from reaching perfection that, because of rebellion at Meribah (Numb. xx. 24), he was not permitted to enter the land of promise. 3. *The atonement of Jesus Christ is actual, that of Aaron was only typical.* After these rites of consecration were observed, the priests were qualified to present the offerings and sacrifices of the people unto God, and to make reconciliation for them. But there was no inherent virtue in those sacrifices to remove the guilt of sin; it is the blood of Christ that has power to cleanse the conscience from dead works. He bore our sins in his own body on the tree, and brought in everlasting righteousness. 4. *The priesthood of Christ is perpetual, that of Aaron only survived by successors.* The high priests died and passed away, their places occupied by others. Jesus abides for ever; he hath an unchangeable priesthood, after the order of Melchizedek. If, then, the Israelites found satisfaction in contemplating the functions of dying men, with what profound delight should we avail ourselves of the intercession of him who ever lives to save!—S. R. A.

**Vers. 1—6.—The baptism of Aaron and his sons.** Hitherto this book consists of precepts and directions concerning the sacrifices and services of the tabernacle; but here a new section commences, in which the directions are described as carried into effect. This section appropriately commences with the history of the consecration of Aaron and his sons, with whom principally was to rest the carrying out of the laws. The verses before us describe—

**I. THE PREPARATIONS FOR THE CEREMONY.** 1. *These were directed by the Lord.* (1) He had formerly given very particular directions from the summit of Mount Sinai (Exod. xxviii., xxix.). In pursuance of these instructions, the holy garments were made and other preparations completed. Note: The leadings of providence should be

closely followed. (2) Now the time has come for carrying the directions of Deity into fuller accomplishment. The tabernacle has been finished and occupied by the presence of God; the laws have been published; and the next thing in order is the consecration of the priests to serve the tabernacle. The Lord is a God of order. In his service "all things" should be done "decently and in order." 2. *His directions were given by the hand of Moses.* (1) Moses was instructed to "take Aaron and his sons," etc. (vers 2, 3). These instructions he punctually obeyed (ver. 4). In this fidelity Moses was a type of Christ, with these differences: (a) Moses was faithful "as a servant," Christ "as a Son." (b) The house of Moses was ceremonial and typical, that of Christ spiritual and living (see Heb. iii. 1-6). (2) Moses, who was instructed to consecrate Aaron and his sons, had himself no human consecration. He was an extraordinary servant of God. We do not read of the apostles of Christ receiving any baptism of water or ordination by imposition of hands. God can send by whom he pleases and when he pleases, without any human sanction (see Gal. i. 15-19). 3. *The congregation was assembled to witness the ceremony.* (1) This was a wise arrangement, to inspire them with proper respect for the servants of God. They were prone enough to say, "Ye take too much upon you, ye sons of Levi." Ministers were publicly ordained in the primitive Church. (2) The address of Moses to the congregation was brief and to the point: "This is the thing which the Lord commanded to be done" (ver. 5). The command, which was given from Sinai, the congregation were acquainted with. The time to carry it out was now given from the sanctuary (ch. i. 1). We should look to God for guidance in reference to times and seasons, as well as to the services to be rendered for him.

II. THE BAPTISM OF AARON AND HIS SONS. 1. *This was the initiatory rite of the consecration.* (1) It was the first act (ver. 6). And as Moses washed Aaron at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, so was Jesus washed by John at his entrance upon his public ministry (see Matt. iii. 16; iv. 1, 17). Like Moses, John also was a Levite. (2) The sons of Aaron were baptized with him. To them also it was the rite of initiation. So are the sons of Jesus initiated into his discipleship by baptism (see Matt. xxviii. 18-20, margin; Acts ii. 41; x. 48). The initiatory office of baptism is also expressed in the phrase "born of water" (John iii. 5). 2. *It set forth the necessity of purity in the servants of God.* (1) Water, being one of the great purifiers in the kingdom of nature, is used in Scripture as an emblem of the Holy Spirit, the Great Purifier in the kingdom of grace (Isa. xliv. 3; John vii. 38, 39). Hence a dispute about "baptism" is called a "question about purifying" (John iii. 25, 26). (2) The requisition of baptism declared the necessity of the baptism of the Holy Ghost. This is the source of the spiritual birth in which commences the spiritual life which is the life of heaven. 3. *As to the form of this baptism.* (1) The record here is simply that "Moses brought Aaron and his sons and washed them with water" (ver. 6). But by reference to Exod. xxx., we learn that this washing was done at the laver. In allusion to the ceremonial baptisms of the Law, the baptism of the Spirit under the gospel is described as the "laver of regeneration" (Titus iii. 5, 6). (2) From the same reference in Exodus we learn, further, that the washing of Aaron and his sons extended to their "hands and feet." There is no proof that they were bodily plunged in the laver. We are reminded how Jesus washed his disciples' feet (see John xiii. 8-10). The Jews have a tradition that a tap was turned on, from which, by the flowing of the water over their hands and feet, the washing was accomplished (see Brown's 'Antiquities,' vol. i. p. 148). In baptism, the element should be active and the subject passive, for the thing signified, the Holy Ghost, certainly is not passive (see Acts ii. 16-18, 33; x. 44-48).—J. A. M.

Vers. 7-9.—*The holy garments of Aaron.* The high priest of the Levitical dispensation is allowed to be an eminent type of the "Great High Priest of our profession." His attire was intended to foreshow the qualities by which the Redeemer is distinguished. Else it would be difficult to account for the minute care with which they were designed, and the manner in which the workmen were inspired to make them (see Exod. xxviii. 2-4; xxxi. 3-6). Let us attend to—

I. THE COAT WITH ITS GIRDLE. 1. *The coat.* (1) According to Josephus, "it was a tunic circumscribing the body, with light sleeves for the arms, and reaching to the heels" ('Ant.', iii. 7). It was white, to denote purity. (2) It was bound with the girdle about the loins. This also was white, and denoted truth, which is another

expression for purity (see Eph. vi. 14). (3) The coat was an inner garment, and bound close to the body with the girdle, to suggest that purity and truth should be found "in the inner parts" (Ps. li. 6; Jer. xxxi. 33; Rom. ii. 29). 2. *There were also breeches.* (1) These are not mentioned here, but they are described in Exod. xxviii. 42, "And thou shalt make them linen breeches to cover their nakedness" (Hebrew, "the flesh," etc.); "from the loins even unto the thighs they shall reach." (2) These also were white, expressive of purity, and without these the priest may not appear in the presence of God. They import that "flesh and blood cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven" until "clothed upon" (see Ezek. xliv. 17, 18; 2 Cor. v. 2, 3; Rev. iii. 18).

II. THE EPHOD WITH ITS ROBE. 1. *The ephod.* (1) It was a short tunic, according to Josephus, reaching to the loins. It consisted of a rich cloth composed of blue, purple, scarlet, and fine twined linen, interwoven with threads of gold, and wrought, some think, into figures of cherubim and palm trees. It was without sleeves, but resting upon the shoulders. (2) It was an emblem of redemption. Ephod (אֵפֹד) comes from the verb (אָפַד or אָפַד), *to redeem*. This is the derivation given by Alexander Pirie, the author of a learned 'Dissertation on Hebrew Roots.' 2. *The robe of the ephod.* (1) This, and the holy garments in general which were associated with the ephod, from it derive the name of the "robe of righteousness" and "garments of salvation" (see Isa. xli. 10, margin). They were the garments in which the typical high priest carried out the business of redemption. (2) The colour of the robe was blue—the dye of heaven, which was with the ancients the symbol of divinity. This over the coat, the emblem of purity, would mark the purity of Messiah to be Divine; so, not derived, but essential and absolute. (3) Upon the hem of the robe round about were "golden bells," which, when they sounded, indicated the sound of salvation. And they were on the "hem" of the robe when the high priest went up into the holy place, that the sound might be heard below. The sound of the gospel accordingly was heard below, as a "sound from heaven," when Jesus went up into the heavens. (4) The pomegranates alternating with the bells suggested the fruit which follows the preaching of the gospel.

III. THE BREASTPLATE WITH THE URIM AND THUMMIM. 1. *The Urim and Thummim were the stones set in the breastplate.* (1) In the text we read of the Urim and Thummim, but here is no mention of the stones. In the parallel place (Exod. xxix. 8—12) the stones are mentioned, but we read there nothing of the Urim and Thummim. This is intelligible if they be the same; but if not, the double omission in things so important is inexplicable. (2) An attentive consideration of Exod. xxviii. 29, 30 will show that the Urim and Thummim are the substance upon which the names of the tribes were engraven. The use ascribed to the stones in one verse is in the next ascribed to the Urim and Thummim. 2. *They represented the saints as cherished in the heart of Christ.* (1) The names of the tribes of Israel were there; and the spiritual Israel are upon the heart of Jesus. These names were *engraven* to show how deeply and permanently our interests have entered into his sympathies. They are engraven in *gems* to show how precious to him are his saints (Mal. iii. 17). The gems were various, and yet all were united in the breastplate of the high priest, to show how individuality can be preserved in those who are united in the love of Jesus. (2) These were called the Urim and Thummim, lights and perfections, or lights and perfect ones: so are Christians called the lights of the world, because they reflect the splendours of the Light of the world. They are perfect ones also, viz. in the loveliness of Jesus (Matt. v. 15, 16; Jude 24). (3) The breastplate was fastened to the ephod with golden chains, which were also connected with rings in the curious girdle of the ephod, from which it was forbidden to separate it (Exod. xxviii. 28). So are we with precious bonds girded to the Redeemer, from which blessed union it would be sinful and disastrous to become dislinked. (4) There were also connected with this robe of redemption on the shoulders of the high priest onyx stones, set in sockets of gold, upon which the names of the tribes of Israel were again engraven. So does Jesus bear his saints upon his shoulder as well as upon his heart. They have his sustaining power as well as the animation of his love.

IV. THE MITRE WITH ITS GOLDEN PLATE. 1. *The mitre.* (1) This was like a turban bound round the head. (2) It was an ornament of honourable distinction. The term here used is rendered "diadem" in Job xxix. 14. 2. *The golden plate.* (1) This

was upon the front of the mitre. It appears to have been ornamented with flowers and leaves. Possibly there is an allusion to this when the Psalmist, speaking of Messiah, says, "but upon himself shall his crown flourish." This plate is called the "holy crown" in the text. (2) The inscription upon it characterized Christ. The words were "Holiness unto the Lord," or "The Holy One of Jehovah." If these holy garments were intended to create respect for the priesthood among the people of Israel, how we should reverence the glorious Antitype!—J. A. M.

Vers. 10-12.—*Levitical anointings.* The subjects of these anointings, as brought under our notice in the text, are, generally, "the tabernacle and all that was therein." From amongst these included things we have afterwards particularly specified, "the altar and all his vessels," and "the laver and his foot." The anointing of Aaron also is distinctly mentioned. We shall review these in order.

I. THE TABERNACLE. 1. *This was an emblem of the moral universe.* The holy places represented the heavens (Heb. viii. 1, 2). Thus (1) the most holy place, where the shechinah was, represented the "heaven of heavens," the "third heaven," or that which, by way of distinction and excellence, is called "heaven itself" (Heb. ix. 24). (2) The holy place, which must be passed through in order to reach the most holy, represented those regions of the moral universe through which Jesus passed on his way from his cross to the throne of his majesty (Heb. iv. 14; vii. 26). In that passage he was "in paradise," and sometimes manifesting himself to his disciples (see Ps. xvi. 10; Acts ii. 23-32; Luke xxiii. 43; xxiv. 15, 16, 31, 36, 51). The spiritual world is not far from us. (3) If the most holy place represented the "third heaven," and the holy place leading to it the *second*, then the court of the priests will stand for the *first*. It describes the "kingdom of heaven" on earth, in other words, the spiritual Church of God. In this we are already "come," in faith and hope and joy, "unto Mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem," etc., and hear the very voice of Jesus from the heavens above us (see Heb. xii. 22-25). (4) The courts outside represented the Church in its visible part, viz. the court of Israel, the court of the women, and the court of the Gentiles. The distinctions which formerly existed here are now done away, so that instead of three, the courts are one (see Gal. iii. 25-28; Eph. ii. 11-19). It is well to be found in these courts, for all outside are in alienation. But we should not rest satisfied with the profession of the outer court. Without the spiritual experience of the court of the priests we can never pass into the heavens "whither the Forerunner is for us entered" (Heb. vi. 19, 20). 2. *It was sanctified with the holy anointing oil* (ver. 10). (1) This oil represented the Holy Spirit in his gifts and graces (comp. Acts i. 5 with x. 38; see also 2 Cor. i. 21; 1 John ii. 20, 27). It was of peculiar composition. The formula is given in Exod. xxx. 23-25; but on pain of excommunication it must not be put to common use (Exod. xxx. 31-33). The person and offices of the Holy Ghost must be held in the greatest reverence; to profane these is fatal wickedness (Matt. xii. 31, 32). (2) With this oil the tabernacle was "sanctified," that is, separated to God. It was so separated to him for services of worship. Also to be a shadow of heavenly things. So the moral universe is claimed by God. The gifts and graces of the Holy Spirit are the principles of universal sanctification.

II. THE ALTAR AND THE LAVER. 1. *The altar and all his vessels.* (1) This is obviously the altar of burnt offerings which stood in the court of the priests. The "vessels" were those for receiving the blood of the sacrifices, and all the implements used in connection with the service of the altar. (2) It typified Calvary, the altar upon which the Great Sacrifice of the gospel was offered. And taken in a grander sense, in consistency with the magnificence of the figure in which the tabernacle represents the great universe of God, this earth was the altar upon which our Lord was offered. (3) The altar was sprinkled with the oil "to sanctify it." The earth is thereby marked out as destined to be sanctified to God, and sanctified too by the gifts and graces of the Holy Spirit. It was sprinkled "seven times," to show the perfectness of that sanctification. And is not this the burden of prophetic hope (Ps. xxxvii. 10, 11, 34; Isa. xi. 6-9)? 2. *The laver and his foot.* (1) This also was located in the court of the priests. In it they washed their hands and feet, and also the parts of the sacrifices requiring washing according to the Law. (2) The anointing of this was "to

sanctify it," or separate it to God. It was separated to him for the purposes of the ceremonial service. It was also separated, to represent the "laver of regeneration" under the gospel, or the "renewing of the Holy Ghost" (Titus iii. 5). Those who are spiritually baptized into Christ are anointed with the gifts and graces of his Holy Spirit.

**III. AARON.** 1. *The oil was poured upon Aaron's head.* (1) This anointing was profuse. "Poured" (see Ps. cxxxiii. 2). (2) It was "to sanctify him." He was thus separated to accomplish the service of God in the tabernacle. He was also separated to typify the Great High Priest of the gospel. 2. *But when was the true oil poured upon Jesus?* (1) We have seen that, as Aaron was washed with water, so was Jesus, viz. at the Jordan (notes on vers. 1—6). But the baptism of Jesus there was not so truly that conferred by John as that which came upon him from heaven (Matt. iii. 16). (2) The second act in the consecration of Christ appears to have been in the mount of transfiguration. There he had the "oil that maketh the face to shine," and was "anointed with the oil of gladness above his fellows" (Ps. xlv. 7). This dazzling lustre of the Holy Spirit was so profuse as to stream not only out of the pores of his skin, but to brighten all his raiment (comp. Ps. cxxxiii. 2; Matt. xvii. 2). (3) As at the Jordan the voice of the Father was heard from the excellent glory approving, so on Tabor the same voice is heard again (comp. Matt. iii. 17; xvii. 5). He that received the Spirit "not by measure" is emphatically *THE Messiah, THE Anointed One.*—J. A. M.

**Vera 13—21.—The vesting of the priests and the offerings for them.** In the order of the ceremonies at the consecration of the priests, after the anointing of Aaron, we have—

**I. THE CLOTHING OF AARON'S SONS.** (Ver. 13.) 1. *They were types of Christians.* (1) The high priest, as we have seen, was a type of Christ. So were the priests in general types also of him, viz. in everything in which they acted as representatives of the high priest. (2) But under usual conditions they should be viewed as emblems of Christians. This is evidently taught in such references as Exod. xix. 6; Heb. x. 9—22; 1 Pet. ii. 9; Rev. i. 6; v. 10. 2. *Their holy garments resembled some of Aaron's.* (1) Aaron had some by which he was distinguished from his sons, and so has Christ unique qualities. In everything pertaining to his Divinity he stands alone. He claims the deepest reverence. (2) The coats and girdles which Moses put upon the sons of Aaron were similar to those articles bearing the same name in which Aaron was clothed. In Aaron's case, as we have seen, they denoted purity and truth; and so do they denote these qualities in relation to his sons (see Eph. vi. 14; Rev. xix. 8). (3) This identity suggests that Christians have their righteousness in virtue of their association with Christ (see Jer. xxiii. 6; Rom. iii. 22; 1 Cor. i. 30; Phil. iii. 9). This is otherwise shown in the fact that the claim of the Levitical priests to those holy garments was in virtue of their being sons of Aaron. Only the "seed" of Messiah (Isa. liii. 10, 11), are clothed in the "white linen which is the righteousness of the saints." 3. *Moses also put bonnets upon them.* (1) These, like the coats, were made of white linen, and so, likewise, expressed purity. They were similar to the turban of Aaron, minus the "plate of the holy crown of pure gold," and its fastenings of lace-work of blue (Exod. xxxix. 30, 31). (2) These bonnets were "for glory and for beauty" (Exod. xxviii. 40). For "glory," i.e. honour, viz. as they served to distinguish the priests as the ministers of God. If a messenger be despised, his message may be brought into contempt. And for "beauty," viz. as they represented the "beauty of holiness." True Christian honour is evermore the associate of holiness.

**II. THE OFFERINGS FOR THE PRIESTS.** In respect to these we observe: 1. *The priests laid their hands upon the heads of the animals* (vers. 14, 18). (1) This was the sign of the confession of sin. It was also the sign of the transfer of sin, so constituting the animal (in type) vicariously a sinner or sin-bearer, liable to suffer its penalty. (2) The next thing in order, therefore, was the bleeding of the animal, in consideration of which the offerer stands justified or released from the obligation to suffer. (3) The reference in all this to the vicarious sacrifice of Christ and our justification through faith in him cannot be mistaken. (4) But why did Aaron, the type of Christ, act thus? Christ had no sin of his own to confess, and needed no sacrifice for himself. The answer is that Aaron, in this, acted not as a type of Christ, but for himself as a sinful man, and representatively for the people (see Heb. v. 1—3). In this Aaron is *contrasted*

with Jesus (see Heb. vii. 26-28). 2. *The altar was purified with the blood* (vers. 15, 19). (1) The earth, as the altar upon which the great Antitype was offered, is purified by his blood. (a) As respects its inhabitants. (b) As respects itself. The inheritance of man is also redeemed by Christ from the curse of sin. (c) The full effects of this will be seen "in the regeneration" or renewed state of the earth indicated in prophecy. (2) The altar was purified with the typical blood "to make reconciliation upon it." So is this earth for the same purpose sanctified by the blood of Jesus. There is no other planet, at least so far as we are concerned, thus sanctified. Therefore if we be not *here* "reconciled to God through the death of his Son," there is no hope for reconciliation hereafter or elsewhere (see Heb. x. 26, 27). 3. *The offerings were presented upon the altar.* (1) In the case of the sin offering, the fat was burnt upon the altar, while the body of the beast was burnt without the camp (ver. 16, 17). Not only was Christ offered up as a sacrifice for sin generally upon this earth, but more particularly "without the gate," viz. of Jerusalem (comp. Heb. xiii. 11, 12). (2) In the case of the burnt offering, the whole ram was burnt upon the altar. This holocaust showed how absolutely God claims us, and therefore how completely we should be devoted, and, so to speak, consumed, in his worship and service (Ps. lxix. 9; John ii. 13-17).—J. A. M.

Vers. 22-36.—*The ram of consecration.* This and the ceremonies connected form the principal subject of the verses now recited. We notice—

I. THAT IT WAS A PEACE OFFERING. 1. *The first ram was a burnt offering.* (1) It was wholly consumed upon the altar. It was regarded wholly as the "food of God" (ch. iii. 11; xxi. 6; Ezek. xliv. 7; Mal. i. 7, 12). (2) In this sacrifice God is contemplated as a righteous Judge, whose justice claims everything we are and have, and who, until that justice is satisfied, can have no fellowship with man. 2. *Burnt offerings were usually accompanied by peace offerings.* (1) Of these a portion was eaten by the worshipper. This was the expression of peace, reconciliation, fellowship. Constantly associated with the holocaust, the opportunity of ceremonially feasting with God was never wanting. In the peace offering faith discerns the sacrifice of Christ to have so completely met the claims of infinite justice, that we are now accepted into favour. (2) As in the other sacrifices, the hands of Aaron and his sons were laid upon it to confess their sinfulness, their need of a Saviour, and their faith in the Redeemer of promise. It was slain accordingly, to foreshadow the death of Messiah. The fat and gall were burnt, to show how our evil passions, the old man, must be crucified with him, that the body of sin may be destroyed.

II. THAT ITS BLOOD WAS USED IN A REMARKABLE WAY. 1. *It was sprinkled upon Aaron.* (1) Upon his person. (a) On the tip of his right ear, to express *obedience* (Exod. xxi. 6). And our Lord's obedience was unto death (Phil. ii. 8). (b) On the thumb of the right hand, to express the service of *doing*. Christ fulfilled all righteousness, and finished the work that was given him to do (John iv. 34; v. 17; ix. 4; xvii. 4; Heb. x. 5-7). (c) On the great toe of the right foot, to express the *ways*. All the ways of Jesus were infinitely pleasing to God (Ps. i. 6; xviii. 20, 21; Acts x. 38). (d) The comprehensive teaching here is the complete consecration of all faculties and energies (see 1 Pet. i. 15). (2) Upon his garments. In this baptism oil also was used (ver. 30). While in detail these garments represented moral qualities, collectively taken they expressed *office*. Hence from the earliest times a person introduced into office is said to be invested in it, from *in*, used intensively, and *vestio*, I clothe. The office of the high priest was to minister in the very presence of God (see Heb. viii. 1, 2). (3) Jesus, who was washed with water at the Jordan, and anointed with oil on the mount of transfiguration, received the final baptism of his consecration, that of his own blood, in Gethsemane and Calvary. As the voice of God accredited him in each of the earlier baptisms, so it accredited him again as he was about to enter into this (comp. Matt. iii. 17; xvii. 5; John xii. 27-33). 2. *It was sprinkled upon Aaron's sons.* (1) Upon their persons (ver. 24). The sons of Aaron were here treated in like manner as Aaron was, to show how in all these things Christians are called to be like Christ (see Matt. xx. 22, 23). This remark will be especially applicable to ministers, who should be "examples to the flock" (see Isa. lxvi. 21; 1 Cor. ix. 13). (2) Upon their garments (ver. 30). The office of the priesthood was to minister in the

presence of God in his tabernacle. So the spiritual priesthood have access to God in heaven. We must be anointed with the unction of the Holy One, and sprinkled with the blood of Christ, that we may enter into that most holy place (Heb. x. 19—22; 1 John ii. 20, 27).

III. THAT IT FILLED THE HANDS OF AARON AND HIS SONS. 1. *It was treated as a wave offering.* (1) The breast had the fat laid upon it. A bread offering also was laid upon it. The whole was then waved before the Lord. The shoulder also was heaved (see Exod. xxix. 27). Thus God was praised as the Creator and Dispenser of every good and perfect gift. (2) Moses acted as priest in all this ceremony. He put these things upon the hands of Aaron and his sons, and waved and heaved them. From this action the ram of consecration took its name (*כָּבֵד בָּרֶךְ, eil milluim*), the *ram of filling up*. Thus the essence of the consecration was the filling the hand with the oblation, or conferring the right to offer sacrifices to God (see Ezek. xlivi. 26, margin). (3) The wave breast then came to the lot of Moses, and Aaron and his sons appear to have shared it with him as the feast upon the sacred food (see ver. 31). 2. *The ceremonies of the consecration lasted seven days.* (1) Seven is the numeral of perfection, so at the close of the seven days this was a perfect consecration, intimating that all the powers of the consecrated ones should be wholly given to God. (2) They "kept the charge of the Lord," during these seven days, "at the door of the tabernacle." They were not as yet qualified to enter the holy place, and they must not leave the court of the priests on pain of death (see 1 Kings xix. 19—21; Matt. viii. 21, 22; Luke ix. 61, 62). (3) "Aaron and his sons did all things which the Lord commanded by the hand of Moses." Had Jesus failed in any point, his consecration would be imperfect; he could not have become our Saviour.—J. A. M.

Vers. 3—5.—*A time for publicity.* The solemn inauguration of Aaron and his sons into their sacred office was to have the utmost possible publicity. This was—

I. A DIVINE INSTRUCTION. The Lord said, "Take Aaron . . . and gather thou all the congregation together," etc. (vers. 1—3). "This is the thing which the Lord commanded to be done" (ver. 5).

II. A PROVISION AGAINST POPULAR JEALOUSY. The scene described in Numb. xvi. shows only too well how necessary it was to convey to "all the congregation" the truth that Aaron and his sons were divinely appointed to their office. This the more because of the near relationship between Moses and Aaron.

III. A PROVISION FOR POPULAR ESTEEM. It was in the last degree desirable that the people should have an exalted idea of the priesthood, and, more especially, of the high priesthood. Everything which would contribute to this would be of real religious service. It was, therefore, fitting that "all the congregation" should be spectators of the impressive solemnities of the inaugural scene.

IV. A HELPFUL INFLUENCE ON THEIR OWN MINDS. It was of equal importance to the Hebrew commonwealth that the priests themselves should cherish a profound sense of the sacred and elevated character of their work. For any irreverence or neglect of theirs was calculated to involve the community in sin and in disaster (see 1 Sam. i. 17; Mal. ii. 8). So solemn and impressive a ceremony as this, in the sight of all the people, would exert a salutary influence on the mind both of father and sons.

In ordinary life, piety and publicity are strangers. Devotion shuts itself in the inner chamber (Matt. vi. 6), or climbs up into the fold of the mountain (Matt. xiv. 23). We nourish our holiest thoughts, and form our best resolves, not in the glare of the public gathering, but in the secret place, when alone with God. Nevertheless, there are occasions when we should not shun publicity; when it is not modesty but weakness to do so. When we avow our attachment to our Saviour, and thus "confess him before men" (Matt. x. 32); still more, when we enter upon any responsible office in connection with his Church (e.g. the Christian ministry); and yet more, if we are summoned, as Aaron was, to any post of unusual eminence and responsibility, we do well to take the vows of God upon us before "all the congregation." If not "a thing which the Lord commanded to be done," it is (1) a Divine suggestion (Acts vi. 7; xiii. 3; 1 Tim. vi. 12); (2) instructive to the people; (3) helpful to ourselves. We need all the influences we can gain from every source to incite us to zealous labour, and to strengthen us against temptation. It is right and wise to avail ourselves of all the

help we gain from the remembrance that we have confessed Christ our Lord, and pledged ourselves to do his work before "all the congregation," "before many witnesses."—C.

Vers. 6-9, 14.—*The human and Divine priesthood—contrast.* The setting apart of Aaron for his life-work, the high priesthood of Israel, naturally suggests to us the entrance of our Great High Priest on the work which his Father gave him to do. Between Aaron and Christ there are many points of resemblance (see below); there are also significant contrasts. Respecting "the High Priest of our profession" (Heb. iii. 2), it is *not* the case that there was—

I. APPOINTMENT TO OFFICE IN VIRTUE OF HUMAN BIRTH. Aaron was chosen to the office of high priest, partly in virtue of his descent from Levi (perhaps partly in virtue of his brotherhood to Moses). His personal qualities were not such as to make him the most suitable man for the office, independently of considerations of lineal descent and human relationship. Jesus Christ did not owe his position as our High Priest to his human birth. He was not, indeed, of the tribe of Levi, but of Judah, "after the flesh." And though, through his mother, he was a son of David, in the matter of human descent, this was not in any way material to his ascent to royal power. His right of office came not thence.

II. IMPOSING INAUGURAL CEREMONY. The scene described in this chapter was striking, imposing, memorable; it would long be borne in mind, never, indeed, forgotten by those who witnessed it. It formed part of the national history. Imagination on our part readily places before us the solemn and suggestive ceremonies which riveted the eyes of the congregation of Israel. Through no such solemnities did One greater than Aaron think well to pass as he entered on his work. It is said that his contemporaries expected the Messiah to descend amongst them from the heavens while they were worshipping in the temple. This he distinctly refused to do (Matt. iv. 5-7). The ceremony of the baptism by John was simple in the extreme. Long chapters of Old Testament Scripture (Exodus and Leviticus) are occupied in narrating the inaugural ceremonies of the human priesthood; five verses suffice to chronicle those of the Divine (Matt. iii. 13-17). The profounder work of the Lord from heaven was more fittingly commenced by that quiet scene on the banks of Jordan.

III. OUTWARD AND VISIBLE DISTINCTION. (Vers. 7-9.) The appearance of Aaron and of his successors in their pontifical attire, as described in this chapter, with rich and coloured garments about them, and the mitre on their head glittering with golden diadem, must have been impressive and imposing enough in the eyes of the people. How striking the contrast with him who was the carpenter's Son of Nazareth, who shunned all ostentation and parade (Matt. xii. 19), who had "no beauty" (of outward appearance) "that we should desire him" (Isa. liii. 2), who attracted disciples to his feet, and sinners to his side, only by the wisdom of his words, and the grace of his spirit and the beauty of his life!

IV. NEED OF PURIFICATION. "Moses brought Aaron and his sons, and washed them with water" (ver. 6). It was needful that they should go through a ceremony which signified the putting away of "all filthiness of the flesh and spirit" (2 Cor. vii. 1). No need of this in the case of the holy Saviour. Whatever his baptism signified, it did not mean this. He was "a High Priest, holy, harmless, undefiled," requiring no cleansing streams whatever (Heb. vii. 26; see John xiv. 30).

V. NEED OF PARDON. "And he brought the bullock for the sin offering: and Aaron," etc. (ver. 14). Before the human high priest could be admitted to the altar, his own sin must be forgiven. Christ entered on his work, not needing to present any oblation. With him, as he was, the Divine Father was "well pleased" (Matt. iii. 17).

In entering on any work to which we may be called of God, we must remember that (1) we have need to purify ourselves of the sin-stains that are left on the soul; (2) we have need to seek for pardon for a faulty past before we go forth to a new future; (3) we may be careless of outward distinctions, considering the lowliness of our Lord.—C.

Vers. 7-9.—*The human and Divine priesthood—comparison.* Between the priesthood of Aaron and that of the Lord Jesus Christ there are not only points of contrast (see above) but also of resemblance. The "holy garments" in which the human priest was

attired supplied marked and intentional suggestions of the attributes and the work of the Divine. Thus we are reminded by Aaron's appearance of—

I. **HIS PERSONAL HOLINESS.** “The stuff of all of them was linen, and . . . must be understood to have been white.” This was associated with the idea of bodily cleanness, and hence with righteousness of soul (see Rev. xix. 8). The High Priest of our profession was he “that loved righteousness,” of whom it was true that “the sceptre of righteousness was the sceptre of his kingdom” (Heb. i. 8, 9).

II. **HIS ALL-SUFFICIENT STRENGTH.** The girdle with which Aaron was girded (ver. 7) was suggestive of strength, activity, readiness for the appointed work. To “gird up the loins” was to be prepared for immediate and effective action. Christ is he who always stands ready and mighty to save; prepared at the moment of *our* readiness to put forth his arm of power, and to redeem us with the “saving strength of his right hand.”

III. **HIS REPRESENTATIVE CHARACTER.** On the breastplate of the ephod (ver. 8) were the names of the twelve tribes of Israel. With these on his person he appeared before God in the holy place; evidently representing them and appearing on their behalf. Our Divine Redeemer, assuming our human nature, suffered and died in our stead, and now “appears in the presence of God for us” (Heb. ix. 24).

IV. **HIS SPIRITUAL FITNESS FOR HIS GREAT WORK.** The “Urim and Thummim” (ver. 8) signified “lights” and “perfections;” they were the means by which Aaron received inspiration from Jehovah. Our Lord was one “in whom dwelleth all the fulness of the godhead bodily” (Col. i. 9), particularly (see context) Divine wisdom. He is—not merely *has*, but *is*—“the truth” (John xiv. 6), and He *is* “the wisdom of God” (1 Cor. i. 24, 30; Col. ii. 3). He who, in the exercise of absolute wisdom, knows the mind of the Father, and “knows what is in man” also, is that omniscient One who is perfectly equipped for the wondrous problem he has undertaken to work out.

V. **THE FINAL TRIUMPH OF HIS CAUSE.** “He put the mitre upon his head” (ver. 9). The high priest of Israel had a touch of royalty—he wore a crown upon his head. The High Priest of man is royal also. “Upon his head are many crowns.” He is “exalted to be a prince” as well as a Saviour. And he is “able even to subdue all things unto himself” (Phil. iii. 21; see Phil. ii. 9, 10).

VI. **HIS ULTIMATE DESIGN.** “Upon the mitre, even upon his forefront, did he put the golden plate” (ver. 9), and on this golden diadem were inscribed the sacred, significant words, “Holiness to the Lord” (Exod. xxviii. 36). Did not this sentence, placed in the forefront of the high priest's mitre, signify that the great end of his ministrations was the establishment among all the tribes of Israel of “Holiness to the Lord”? The purpose for which he was appointed would not be attained until that great and noble aim was reached. For that he lived and wrought. That, too, is the end of the Divine priesthood. Christ came to “put away sin by the sacrifice of himself” (Heb. ix. 26), to establish on the earth that kingdom of God which is “righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.”

Let us learn—1. The exceeding greatness of our privilege. *In* Jesus Christ himself (and in his salvation) are these great excellencies; they were only *upon* and *outside* the Hebrew priest. 2. The corresponding guilt of (1) defiant rejection, (2) frivolous disregard, (3) continued indecision (Heb. ii. 3).—O.

Ver. 2.—*Spiritual apparel.* “Take Aaron and his sons with him and the garments.” Aaron and his sons were about to be *invested*. Their formal investiture of the priestly office was to be signified and symbolized by their putting on the sacerdotal garments. The robes of office are fully described (vers. 7—9). These “holy garments” (Exod. xxviii. 2) not only gave an imposing and inspiring appearance to the officiating priests, but they severally and separately suggested certain spiritual qualities. The white linen spoke of righteousness, the girdle of activity or strength, etc. (see above).

We who are servants of Jesus Christ are also priests (1 Pet. ii. 5; Rev. i. 6). There are certain things in which we are to be robed. We are, speaking generally, to “put on the Lord Jesus Christ” (Rom. xiii. 14); to put on “the new man,” etc. (Eph. iv. 24). But there are certain graces which we are more particularly to wear.

I. **THE ROBE OF HUMILITY.** This is the beginning and the end, the first and the last grace, the foundation and the topstone of Christian character: we may call it an

under-garment and an overcoat of the Christian wardrobe. "Be clothed with humility" (1 Pet. v. 5).

II. THE GARMENT OF FAITH. This is that clothing without which we cannot be justified before God now, nor permitted to sit down to the heavenly banquet hereafter (Matt. xxii. 11, 12).

III. THE GIRDLE OF TRUTH. (Eph. vi. 14.) It is truth, heavenly wisdom, which knits all other things together, and gives play and power to the spiritual faculties.

IV. THE SANDALS OF PEACE. (Rom. x. 15; Eph. vi. 15.)

V. THE CROWN OF RIGHTEOUSNESS. (2 Tim. iv. 8.) Righteousness is the regal thing; when that is gone the crown is fallen from our head (Lam. v. 16).

To those who "overcome" (Rev. iii. 5), who are "faithful unto death" (Rev. ii. 10), who "keep the faith" (2 Tim. iv. 7), it shall be given to: 1. Be clothed in white raiment" (spotless purity). 2. To receive "the crown of life" (life in all its celestial fulness and blessedness). 3. To wear "the crown of righteousness"—"a crown of glory that fadeth not away" (1 Pet. v. 4).—C.

Vera. 6, 8, 23, 24, 30.—*Equipment for special work.* There was a sense in which the whole congregation of Israel constituted a priesthood. It was an early promise that they should be a "kingdom of priests and a holy nation" (Exod. xix. 6). And such, indeed, they were, so far as they entered into and fulfilled the purposes of God. They were: 1. Separate from surrounding people (holy unto the Lord). 2. Permitted to draw near to God. 3. Allowed to bring the sacrificial victim to the holy place and slay it; indeed, in the case of the paschal lamb, they acted as priests without aid from any other hand.

But there were those who were: 1. Separated from them, and were thus holier than they. 2. Allowed to draw nearer to the Divine presence. 3. Designated to be continually offering up sacrifices to Jehovah. These were the priests and the high priests of the Lord in an especial sense, and they needed special equipment for their special work. From this chapter we select four principal points—

I. SPECIAL CLEANSING OF SOUL. (Ver. 6.)

II. SPECIAL CONSECRATION OR SPIRIT. (Vers. 23, 24.) One of the most significant rites in the entire ceremony of consecration was the taking by Moses of the blood of the "ram of consecration" (ver. 22), and putting it "upon the tip of Aaron's right ear, and upon the thumb of his right hand, and upon the great toe of his right foot." The interpretation of this symbolism hardly admits of error. What other truth could it import but that Aaron was thus set apart, not only generally for the service of the Lord, but specially in every member of his frame, in every faculty of his mind? He was to have: 1. *An open ear*, to welcome every word of the Lord. 2. *A ready hand*, to discharge diligently and conscientiously his daily duties. 3. *A quick foot*, to run in the way of God's commandments.

III. SPECIAL SYMPATHY WITH MEN. (Ver. 8.) The plate on which were inscribed the names of the twelve tribes was, as the word indicates, a *breast-plate*: so that the high priest symbolically bore the children of Israel on his heart. He carried their burden into the presence of God.

IV. SPECIAL ENDOWMENT. (Ver. 30.) The precious ointment, the anointing oil, upon the head that ran down upon Aaron's beard, that went down to the skirts of his garments (Ps. cxxxiii. 2), probably symbolized the grace of the Spirit of God outpoured upon the heart, affecting the whole nature, diffusing the delightful fragrance of piety and virtue.

We learn from these particulars—1. That we must not covet posts of special difficulty except we are equipped with peculiar qualifications. Not every good or every earnest Christian man is fitted to take high office in the kingdom of God. 2. That if we feel ourselves summoned to special work, we must seek all possible spiritual equipment. The conditions of successful service are those indicated above: (1) The full cleansing of our souls and lives from impurity (Ps. li. 7, 10, 11, 13; Isa. lii. 11; 1 John iii. 3). (2) The dedication of our whole selves to the service of Christ; heart and life; soul and body; having every faculty of the mind, every organ of our frame (ear, hand, foot), ready for sacred work. (3) Tender sympathy with men; "a heart at leisure from itself to soothe and sympathize." We shall do but little for men except we acquire

the blessed art of *sympathizing with them*. A sympathetic spirit is a helpful, influential, winning spirit. (4) Endowment of all needful grace from on high. This must be gained from God, who, in answer to believing prayer, “giveth liberally.” Purity, consecration, sympathy, grace,—these are the qualifications for high office, the sources of power, the assurance of success.—C.

Vers. 33—36.—*The burden of the Lord.* It is in our nature to love distinction, office, power. The instincts and impulses of our humanity enter with us into the service of the Lord; they belong to us as subjects of the kingdom of Christ (see Mark x. 28, 35, etc.). But here, as elsewhere, distinctions and duties, prizes and perils, honours and anxieties go together. We are reminded—

I. THAT PROTRACTED PREPARATION MAY BE NECESSARY for high office in the Church (ver. 33). Aaron and his sons were required to go through consecration services for seven days. It seems to us as if they must have become wearisome by exceeding length. But for such services as he and they were to render, such preparation was none too long. Consider how Moses was long in Midian, and Paul in Arabia, preparing for after-work. Our Lord himself went “into the wilderness” and into “desert places,” preparing himself for his Divine ministry. In proportion to the seriousness, the greatness of the work we have to do, we may expect to find the extent and severity of the preparatory work.

II. THAT UNPALATABLE COMMUNICATIONS MAY HAVE TO BE MADE, in conformity with God’s will. Moses might have shrunk (probably would have done so) from voluntarily imposing such protracted services on Aaron; but he had no option. God’s will was clear, and he had no course but to obey; “so I am commanded,” said he (ver. 35). Again and again the minister of Christ has to say or do things he would gladly leave unsaid or undone. But in such cases he must “not confer with flesh and blood” (Gal. i. 16), but do the will of the Master he serves (see 1 Sam. iii.).

III. THAT DISOBEDIENCE TO THE CLEAR WILL OF GOD INVOLVES great danger: “Keep the charge of the Lord, that ye die not” (ver. 35). We cannot undertake great duties without incurring the most serious responsibilities and running grave risks. If we take the post of “watchman unto the house of Israel,” we must speak the true and faithful word, or the blood of souls will be required at our hand (Ezek. xxxiii. 7, 8). They who stand in God’s house and speak in his Name, but who depart from his Word, grievously mislead their brethren, and must be answerable to the Lord their Judge at the day of account.

IV. THAT AN OBEDIENT HEART NEED NOT, AND WILL NOT, SHRINK FROM THE COMMANDMENTS OF THE LORD. (Ver. 36.) Aaron and his sons did not question or hesitate; they obeyed. Doubtless they found, as we shall find, that: 1. What seems formidable in prospect becomes simple and manageable in actual engagement. 2. God helps with his inspiring Spirit those who go with alacrity to their work. 3. There are unsuspected pleasures in sacred service. “His commandments are not grievous;” his “yoke is easy, his burden light;” his statutes are not our complaints but our songs in the house of our pilgrimage (Ps. cxix. 54).—C.

Vers. 1—5.—*Public inauguration of Divine service.* I. ALL THE PEOPLE GATHERED TOGETHER. 1. *Religion is universal*, as human necessity and sin. God and man reconciled and united in fellowship. No human condition dispenses with worship. We should labour to get *all the people* to the tabernacle. God invites them. His ministers should summon them. No excuse can be suffered either for their absence or for the lack of success in gathering them together. We shall succeed best when we speak to them in the Name of God and with his own Word. Lower means and motives, if employed at all, must be kept in subordinate places. 2. There are *no secrets in religion*; no esoteric doctrine; no rites or privileges which are not for the people. If the priests are set apart, the people witness their consecration, and sanction it and take part in it. The priests are for the people. A Church which withholds a part of the Lord’s Supper from the congregation cannot be a true Church. In the commandment to gather the people was the implicit doctrine of universal priesthood, afterwards (as in 1 Pet.) more perfectly expressed when the great High Priest had come.

II. THE FOUNDATION ON WHICH ALL RELIGION STANDS IS THE REVEALED WORD AND

WILL OF GOD. The Lord spake to Moses. Moses did as the Lord commanded him. Moses said to the congregation, "This is the thing which the Lord commanded to be done." Mere will-worship is unacceptable to God. We must beware of *two errors*. 1. Dependence on mere *tradition* in contrast with the Word. No need of a supplementary revelation, for it implies that the Word was not sufficient—no authority in it, for the fathers and those who handed on the tradition were liable to err and falsify. 2. Expediency may mislead us into disobedience; fashion in worship; convenience consulted; pure truth hidden; man usurping God's place.

III. PUBLIC CONSECRATION OF PRIESTHOOD. The people saw the men, their garments, the consecrating oil, the atoning sacrifices, the basket of unleavened bread. 1. Spiritual leaders should be distinguishable, both personally and officially. 2. We should remember they are men, and liable to sin, and needing the same sacrifices as all others. 3. The unleavened bread of sincerity and truth is their main qualification. 4. They are nothing unless anointed, i.e. they are wholly dependent on the Spirit of God—not a line of succession, but a personal inspiration. 5. Their ministry being for the people, among the people, and with the help of the people, let the people by their assembly sanction their election and approve their consecration. A God-given ministry is not imposed upon congregations, but welcomed by their free choice.—R.

Ver. 6.—"And Moses brought Aaron and his sons, and washed them with water." Not hands and feet only, as in daily ministrations, but the whole body, symbolizing entire spiritual cleansing.

I. Take this cleansing as MAN'S OBEDIENCE. It set forth: 1. Confession of sin and dependence on Divine grace. 2. Personal consecration—entire devotion to the service of God. 3. As performed by priests, the acceptance of a place in the priestly office and before the altar demanded conspicuous holiness and purity.

II. Thus was typified THE DIVINE PROMISE. 1. That man should be cleansed really by the Spirit. 2. That a perfect high priesthood should be provided. 3. That the necessary imperfection and impurity of an earthly service should be swallowed up hereafter in the holy perfection of the heavenly service, when all that approach God shall be like him.—R.

Vers. 7-9.—*Aaron's dress.* Coat, girdle, robe, ephod, breastplate, Urim and Thummim, mitre, golden plate, and crown,—all significant, and fulfilled in Christ. The two main ideas are *mediation* and *government*.

I. The high priest is clothed as MEDIATOR. 1. To offer sacrifice for sins. 2. To enter into the presence of Jehovah as intercessor. 3. To obtain and pronounce, as representative, the Divine benediction.

II. The high priest is clothed as KING. 1. With power to guide, counsel, command as an oracle. 2. With exalted personality to receive homage as the king of righteousness, the glory of God revealed. 3. As crowned, to establish and maintain his kingdom among men—ruling their hearts and lives, not by the power of this world, but by the priestly power of fellowship with God, for man is himself made kingly as he is admitted into the innermost chamber of God's presence.—R.

Vers. 10-12.—*Anointing.* The tabernacle, the altar, the vessels, the laver and its foot, Aaron the high priest. The main intention to lift up the thoughts of all, both priests and people, to Jehovah as the Source of all good gifts. The sprinkling was seven times, to denote the covenant relation between God and Israel.

I. The service of God requires SPECIAL CONSECRATION—both of persons and places and instrumentalities. 1. To keep the world's corruption away. 2. To exalt the faculties and feelings. 3. To help us to maintain the remembrance of the Divine covenant, and therefore to lay hold by special intercourse with God of his gifts. 4. To enable us, by concentration of efforts, to make the influence of religion more powerful in the world. Great mistake to suppose that, by breaking down distinctions between the believing and the unbelieving, the multitudes are brought nearer to God; on the contrary, the effect is to lessen the spiritual efficacy of religious ordinances, and to postpone the triumph of God's people.

II. The TRUE ANOINTING OF THE SPIRIT, THE TRUE DISTINCTION OF THE MINISTRY AND

OF THE MEANS EMPLOYED. 1. Distinguish between the rite itself and its fulfilment. Man anoints with oil, God with the Spirit. The two baptisms with water and with the Holy Ghost. 2. Special responsibility of those in office for the possession of spiritual power. We must not worship our own nets. They are nothing if not successful. By their fruits the living trees will be known. 3. God will be inquired of to bestow his grace; the anointing by his commandment was a renewal of his promise to bestow his gifts when they are asked. It was a covenant ceremony, and represented a covenant life. 4. Spiritual men engaged in the fulfilment of spiritual duties will, as much as possible, separate themselves from all earthly entanglements and incumbrances. The oil was poured on the head of the priest, and flowed downwards to the skirts of his garments, to signify that he must be totally possessed by the claims of his office, and endowed in every energy and act by the bestowment of the Spirit. What an encouragement to holiness, and at the same time what an incentive to prayer! We are kings and priests. If we forget our anointing, we not only lose our priestly purity, but our princely power over the world. A degraded priesthood the curse of the Church and the plague of mankind. A revived ministry the hope of the future. "Brethren, pray for us." "Ye have an unction from the Holy One."—R.

Vers. 13—36.—*The sacrifices of consecration.* Aaron and his sons. Holy week of separation. "So Aaron and his sons did all things which the Lord commanded by the hand of Moses." Moses, the mediator of the covenant, consecrated those who should afterwards fulfil the functions of the sanctuary. The order of the sacrifices was: 1. The sin offering. 2. The burnt offering. 3. The peace offering. Or (1) *expiation*, (2) *obedience*, (3) *acceptance*—the three great facts of the covenant life of God's people. That all these should be included in the consecration of the priesthood betokened the entire subordination of that mere temporary mediation to the fundamental relation between God and man. No priest was between the holiness of God and the sinfulness of men in any other sense than as a servant of that covenant which came out of the free grace of God. Here there is—

I. THE TRUE BASIS OF RELIGION set forth. It rests on (1) *the universal necessity of man*, and (2) *the universality of Divine grace*. Illustrate from history of man's religions how this basis has been ignored. Priesthood raised above people as though holy in themselves. Favouritism in heaven the exciting motive to sacrifices. Merit in man the measure of peace.

II. The typical significance of the Mosaic economy pointing to the PERFECTION OF THE DIVINE PROVISION FOR HUMAN SALVATION. All the priests, Aaron and his sons, are sinful, and require sacrifices of atonement. Their confession of imperfection was itself an appeal to God to supply the sinless priest, the perfect service, the everlasting mediation. Jesus Christ the High Priest. 1. His *official perfection*, arising out of his personal dignity as Son of God, and yet able to sympathize with those for whom he intercedes as Son of man. Spotless purity and perfect obedience could alone satisfy the requirements of a perfect Law. 2. Our faith in Christ sees in him not only a priestly Person, but a *Sacrifice actually offered*. The true sacrificial work of Christ was not merely his humiliation in living a human life, but his death on the cross, which was supremely the offering up of his blood, his life, as a true substitution for man. The death of the victim was a necessary part of the ceremony. Thus our High Priest must enter the holiest with blood, and no blood but his own could represent the whole humanity of man offered up—no sufferings but his could express perfect fulfilment of the Father's will. 3. The priesthood of Christ *secures our acceptance, and makes our religious life liberty*, not bondage.—R.

## EXPOSITION.

### CHAPTER IX.

THE FIRST PRIESTLY ACTS OF AARON AND his sons are recounted in the chapter following that which narrates their consecration.

Vers. 1—6.—On the eighth day. The

seven days of consecration being now over, Aaron for the first time offers a sin offering and burnt offering for himself, and a sin offering, a burnt offering, a peace offering, and a meat offering for the congregation. He is still instructed by Moses as to what he is to do, but it is through him that the com-

mand is given to the people to present their offerings, and it is he that slays the victims and offers their blood. His own sin offering is a young calf, or young bull calf, whereas the sin offering commanded for the high priest on ordinary occasions was a young bull, further advanced in age (ch. iv. 3); and in presenting the blood he does not take it into the sanctuary according to the regulations in ch. iv. 6, but uses it as Moses had done in the sin offerings of the previous week, the purpose of the difference being to show that Aaron's full dignity had not yet devolved upon him. This did not take place until he had gone into the tabernacle with Moses (ver. 23). A ram is again taken for the burnt offering, as had been the case in Moses' sacrifice of the previous week. The children of Israel now present a kid, the offering generally made by a prince, that for the congregation being a young bull. In the words for to day the Lord will appear unto you, Moses promises the Divine appearance afterwards vouchsafed (ver. 23).

Ver. 7.—*Make an atonement for thyself, and for the people.* By means of the sin offering for the high priest, whose sin brought guilt both on himself and upon the people (ch. iv. 3). After he had (symbolically) purified himself and them of this guilt, he was to offer the offering of the people, which should purify them from the guilt contracted by their own sins, and make an atonement for them.

Vers. 8-14.—The high priest's sin offering and burnt offering for himself. The meat offering does not appear to have accompanied the burnt offering—the law having not yet been promulgated which ordered that the two sacrifices should always be presented together (Numb. xv. 4). The burnt offering, with the pieces thereof, in ver. 13, should rather be the *burnt offering in its several pieces*. The sinfulness of the Aaronic priesthood and the need of a perfect priest is indicated by this sacrifice (see Heb. vii. 24-27).

Vera. 15-21.—The people's sin offering, burnt offering, meat offering, and peace offerings follow. The meat offering is said to have been burnt upon the altar, beside the burnt sacrifice of the morning. It is probable that, on this occasion, the people's burnt offering, which consisted of a calf and a lamb, took the place of the ordinary morning sacrifice of a lamb (Exod. xxix. 38). Aaron is said to have offered the burnt offering according to the manner, or, as it is given in the margin, *ordinance*, that is, he burnt the flesh on the altar (ch. i. 7-9); he also burnt the handful of the meat offering, and he burnt the fat of the peace offering, upon the altar. He had previously

burnt the fat of his own sin offering, and the flesh of his burnt offering. Fire, therefore, was present upon the altar, and was used by Aaron, as by Moses, for sacrificial purposes before the fire came out from the Lord as described in ver. 24.

Ver. 22.—*And Aaron lifted up his hand or (according to the more probable reading) hands.* This was the first priestly benediction by Aaron, given from the elevated standing-place which he occupied by the side of the altar.

Ver. 23.—*Moses (for the last time) and Aaron (for the first time) went into the tabernacle in the character of priest.* During this visit Moses committed to Aaron the care of the things within the tabernacle, as he had already given him the charge of all connected with the sacrifices of the court. Not till after this is Aaron fully initiated into his office. “No man taketh this honour unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron” (Heb. v. 4). On coming out from the tabernacle, Moses and Aaron, standing near the door, unite in blessing the congregation, in order to show the harmony between them and the capacity of blessing in the Name of the Lord enjoyed by Aaron as by Moses. The latter has now divested himself of that part of his office which made him the one mediator between God and his people. Aaron is henceforth a type of Christ as well as Moses. While giving the joint blessing, the glory of the Lord appeared unto all the people, proceeding from the ark, and enveloping the lawgiver and the priest as they stood together.

Ver. 24.—*And there came a fire out from before the Lord.* The sacrifices were already smouldering on the altar, a ram, a calf, and a lamb, besides the internal fat of a young bull, a kid, a bullock, and a ram, and a handful of flour. They would have continued smouldering all the day and the night, but a miraculous fire issued from the tabernacle, and consumed the whole in the sight of the people. So fire fell and consumed Solomon's sacrifice at the dedication of the temple. Jewish tradition reports that the fire was always kept alive until the reign of Manasseh, when it became extinguished. *When the people saw this sight, they shouted, and fell on their faces.* They had been standing in a state of intense expectation, awaiting the fulfilment of the promise that the Lord would appear unto them to-day, and watching the acts of the two brothers; and their feelings are now raised to the utmost enthusiasm and awe by the appearance of the glory of the Lord and the action of the Divine fire. See 2 Chron. vii. 3.

## HOMILETICS.

**Vers. 8—23.**—The first act of the new priesthood is sacrifice, by which reconciliation was ceremonially effected; the second (vers. 22, 23), a double benediction. As soon as the people are reconciled to him, God's blessing abundantly pours itself on them. The sacrifice is: 1. For themselves, showing the weakness of the Aaronic priesthood. 2. For the people, showing its power.

**Ver. 24.**—*Miraculous confirmation of the new polity* is given by a fire issuing from the presence of God.

**I. INSTANCES OF A LIKE KIND OF DIVINE AGENCY BY FIRE.** 1. The case of Gideon. “And the angel of God said unto him, Take the flesh and the unleavened cakes, and lay them upon this rock, and pour out the broth. And he did so. Then the angel of the Lord put forth the end of the staff that was in his hand, and touched the flesh and the unleavened cakes; and there rose up fire out of the rock, and consumed the flesh and the unleavened cakes” (Judg. vi. 20, 21). 2. The case of Elijah. “Call ye on the name of your gods, and I will call on the Name of the Lord: and the God that answereth by fire, let him be God. And all the people answered and said, It is well spoken. . . . Then the fire of the Lord fell, and consumed the burnt sacrifice and the wood, and the stones, and the dust, and licked up the water that was in the trench” (1 Kings xviii. 24—38). 3. The case of Solomon. “Now when Solomon had made an end of praying, the fire came down from heaven, and consumed the burnt offering and the sacrifices; and the glory of the Lord filled the house. And the priests could not enter into the house of the Lord, because the glory of the Lord had filled the Lord's house” (2 Chron. vii. 1, 2).

**II. THE RESULT IN EACH CASE IS AWE.** 1, “Gideon said, Alas, O Lord God! for because I have seen an angel of the Lord face to face. And the Lord said unto him, Peace be unto thee; fear not: thou shalt not die” (Judg. vi. 22, 23). 2. “And when all the people saw it, they fell on their faces: and they said, The Lord, he is the God; the Lord, he is the God” (1 Kings xviii. 39). 3. “And when all the children of Israel saw how the fire came down, and the glory of the Lord upon the house, they bowed themselves with their faces to the ground upon the pavement, and worshipped, and praised the Lord, saying, For he is good; for his mercy endureth for ever” (2 Chron. vii. 3).

**III. THE PRESENT A FITTING OCCASION FOR A MIRACULOUS INTERVENTION.** A miracle is to be expected at the introduction of any new system which emanates from God, because it is a means of showing Divine approval which cannot be gainsaid; but it is not to be expected frequently afterwards, or it would lose its special effect of impressing by its strangeness. The institution of the Law is such an occasion, and accordingly fire and smoke and earthquake showed the presence of God on Sinai. The institution of an hereditary priesthood was a part of the legislation which, being a vast change on the previously existing system, specially required a sign of God's approval which all might see. The erection of Solomon's temple was a like occasion. So at the institution of the Christian dispensation, miraculous gifts were vouchsafed to the apostles—speaking with tongues, prophecy, gifts of healing, and the rest—which were not intended to continue, and died out as soon as the Church was regarded as no longer coming into being, but fully formed. No new doctrine must be accepted except upon the testimony of miracle, but a succession of miracles is not required to certify doctrine which has been once confirmed by miraculous means.

**IV. SIMILARITY YET DIFFERENCE OF THE PENTECOSTAL FIRE.** It was given at the institution of the new apostolic ministry. It was a confirmation of its authority to the minds of the recipients as well as others. But it indicated more than a mere Divine approval of a new system. It symbolized the gift of the Holy Ghost, and therefore it did not consume a sacrifice, but “it sat upon each” of those who were to be the instruments of the Holy Ghost in converting the world, and the ministers of the new dispensation. The fire of jealousy, which struck to the earth those who approached the Divine presence unbidden, has become the fire of love.

## HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

*A sign expected and received.* Ch. ix.; cf. 2 Chron. v. 13, 14; Ezra vi. 16-22; Acts i.; ii. We have now before us the hopeful fashion in which Aaron and his sons entered upon their work. The consecration being completed on the eighth day, Moses directed them to take for themselves a sin offering and a burnt offering, and to receive at the hands of the people similar offerings, and, in addition, a bullock and a ram for peace offerings, with the usual accompaniment of a meat offering, and to expect a sign from the Lord at the conclusion of the service. "To-day," said he, "the Lord will appear unto you." A penitent yet consecrated priesthood, acting on behalf of a penitent and consecrated people, are warranted in expecting a sign from God himself. The first priestly service is thus filled with hope, and the hope was realized at the end of it. The following lessons are plainly taught by this passage—

I. THE ONE INDISPENSABLE PRELIMINARY TO EXALTATION FROM GOD IS HUMILIATION BEFORE HIM. Both priests and people must bring their sin offering and appear in penitential mood. Unless we humble ourselves under the mighty hand of God, we need not expect to be exalted (Matt. xxiii. 12; 1 Pet. v. 6). Hence the Law of the Divine dealings has been to "hide pride from man" (Job xxxiii. 17). It is only when we have pride eliminated that we have room for blessing.

II. CONSCIOUS DEDICATION TO GOD IS AN EARNEST OF BLESSING ON ITS WAY. The priests and people both bring their burnt offerings as well as their sin offerings. They realize how reasonable it is to dedicate themselves to the Lord, who has been so merciful in his dealings with them. It was the same with Solomon and his associates at the dedication of the temple. It was the same with the disciples previous to the Pentecostal baptism. It was consecrated men and women who expected special blessing. And it is the same still; self-emptied, self-dedicated sinners are being qualified for special blessing.

III. THE UNION OF NUMBERS IN DESIRE AND IN HOPE IS ALSO A SIGN OF A COMING BLESSING. The people assembled in their thousands before the tabernacle, and the priests co-operated with them in their offices. One heart and hope animated the host. We see the same unity at the dedication of Solomon's temple. "It came even to pass, as the trumpeters and singers were as one, to make one sound," etc. (2 Chron. v. 13). We see the same unity before Pentecost. "These all continued with one accord in prayer and supplication, with the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with his brethren" (Acts i. 14). Such a union of numbers in desire and in hope should be encouraged continually. It need not be disregarded. It is a sign surely that blessing is on its way when such happy union of heart and hope takes place.

IV. GOD'S RIGHTS MUST BE CAREFULLY REGARDED IF HIS SPECIAL BLESSING IS TO BE OBTAINED. The priests were directed to lay the best portions on the altar, to pay thus their due to God, before the blessing is vouchsafed. This element is sometimes overlooked. People make "systematic beneficence" depend upon special blessing, instead of preceding it. But it is manifest, from Mal. iii. 10, that God asks for proof, in the payment of Divine dues, of people's desire for special blessing. It is idle to expect great blessing from above if men wrong God as they do. His proportion of our substance can be calculated in cool blood and paid conscientiously, without waiting for a baptism in order to do so, and if we are prepared to exhibit our sense of obligation to God in this real way, we may hope for a very special baptism.

V. BENEDICTION MAY BE PRONOUNCED WITH CONFIDENCE IN THE LIGHT OF PROMISED BLESSING. At the conclusion of the ritual, Aaron proceeded to bless the people. His benediction preceded the Divine manifestation. It was pronounced in full view of the promise. It was, as we shall soon see, amply redeemed. And does not this fact throw light upon all benedictions? They are not blessings conveyed through the person pronouncing them, but blessings guaranteed, so to speak, to proceed from God himself on the ground of his own promise. It is the faithful Promiser the people are to look to, not his officer in pronouncing the benediction.

VI. GOD WAS PLEASED TO MANIFEST HIMSELF AS CONSUMING FIRE UPON HIS ALTAR. What God gave was additional fire to the sacred deposit already so carefully preserved.

An intense flame rose up from the altar, having first issued from the tabernacle; and all the people rejoiced because of it. "When all the people saw it, they shouted, and fell on their faces." God is a consuming fire in the way of acceptance, just as well as in the way of wrath. The psalmist gives us clear evidence of this in his prayer, "Remember all thy offerings, and accept ('reduce to ashes,' פְּנִים) thy burnt sacrifice" (Ps. xx. 3). The case of Elijah at Carmel goes to demonstrate the same thing (1 Kings xviii. 24, 36). And when we reach the history of Pentecost, with the Spirit as "tongues of fire" settling down on the disciples, we can have no doubt as to the significance of the manifestation (Acts ii.). "God is light," and along with light there is heat and sublimation. He interposes no screen to prevent the heat-rays from reaching men's hearts. They become fervent in spirit, and thus serve the Lord (Rom. xii. 11). It is this visitation we all need—God accepting us as "living sacrifices," and enabling us most ardently to serve him. May none of us experience the consuming fire of the Divine wrath, but that of the Divine love and mercy!—R. M. E.

Vers. 23, 24.—*The glory of the Lord.* The petition of Moses was, "Show me thy glory." The wisdom, power, and goodness of the Almighty are visible in all his works, and "the heavens declare his glory," but man longs for a fuller display of the matchless perfections of Deity. The artist is superior to his handiwork, and to view God is a greater satisfaction than to contemplate the evidences of his existence and skill that lie around us. To behold him as he is, to "see his face" in its undimmed lustre,—this is reserved as the special joy of heaven. In the mean time, it was permitted the Israelites to gaze upon material manifestations of his presence, and it is the delight of Christians to catch spiritual glimpses of his glory, by faith seeing him who is invisible.

I. THE FORM ASSUMED BY THE GLORY OF THE LORD. 1. *A brightness manifest to all the people.* Compare this passage with Numb. xvi. 42, and the conclusion is natural that there was a brilliant illumination of the cloud that ordinarily rested upon the tabernacle. Therein Jehovah was ever visible, but now revealed in such wondrous guise that his glory was patent to the dullest eye. Deity no longer concealed but expressed. When Jesus Christ came as the Word, the evangelist declares, "We beheld his glory, as of the only begotten of the Father." The face is the noblest part of the body, the dial-plate of character, the index of the soul; hence in the face of Jesus Christ we behold the light of the knowledge of the glory of God. The gospel dispensation "exceeds in glory" (2 Cor. iii. 9), for it is the "ministration of the Spirit," the "ministration of the righteousness" of God. The answer to the request of Moses was contained in the assurance that all the goodness of God should pass before him; and when there is an outpouring of the Spirit, so that many turn to the Saviour and rejoice in the mercy and loving-kindness of God who will have all men to be saved, then is the glory of the Lord revealed and all flesh see it together. 2. *A mighty energy*, as flaming fire, attesting the acceptance of the sacrifices. These were suddenly consumed, showing that the power of God can accomplish at once what at other times requires a long period under the operation of customary laws. There is not merely attractive brilliancy in God, there is majestic might which may be used for or against us, according to our obedience or disobedience. When tongues of fire sat upon the disciples at Pentecost, their whole being—body, soul, and spirit, mind, affection, and will—seemed immediately permeated with the Spirit of Christ, and they spoke with boldness and witnessed with great power, so that thousands were added to the Church. Let God appear, and men shall be saved, not in units, but in multitudes. Who can tell what shall be the result of Christ's appearing in glory? This we know, that the offerings upon the altar, the Christians dedicated to his service, shall be transformed into his likeness, the imitation not gradual as in ordinary seasons, but instantaneous. 3. *The unusual glory proceeding from the ordinary manifestation.* The fire "came out from before the Lord." It was not a different power, therefore, but the usual Shechinah fire exhibited to all in wondrous operation. The truths that evoke such feeling and lead to such holy action in times of refreshing and revival, are those which have been previously insisted on, only now accompanied with potency, the breath of the Spirit kindling the embers into a glow, and causing the heat so to radiate as to affect large circles of humanity. The arm of the Lord, alway present, is revealed; its might, perceived by the few, is shown to the many.

II. THE TIME AT WHICH THE GLORY OF GOD APPEARS. 1. We may expect it at *eventful stages in the history of his Church.* Here at the establishment of the order of priesthood, to sanction it, to express approval of the men appointed, and to complete their consecration. The altar fire and all its future offerings were thus hallowed. When some principle of the Divine government is to be vindicated, or some messenger honoured in the sight of the people, or a new departure made in the accomplishment of his purposes, then may we anticipate displays of supernatural beauty and force. 2. *When his instructions have been respected, his commands faithfully observed.* There had been seven days of watching, and the eighth day was marked by confession of sin and dedicatory sacrifices. God was honoured, and evinced his delight thereat. Sanctification precedes the manifestation of Divine power (Josh. iii. 5; ch. ix. 4). 3. *When it has been prophesied by his servants.* This was a fulfilment of Moses' prediction, and may incite us to study Scripture and value its prophetic statements. It is remarkable how the way has been ever prepared for "mighty works" by previous announcement, as if to fit men to appreciate the miracles and to recognize them as coming from God. The herald proclaims the advent of the king. 4. *When his servants have drawn nigh to his presence, and invoked a blessing upon the people.* Prayer is the fleeting breath that proves of such marvellous efficacy in securing tokens of God's favour. Would we see the glory of God in the sanctuary? then let us try to approach the very throne of Deity. To be led in supplication into the holiest of all is to "bring all heaven before our eyes." Jesus, our Prophet-Priest, ascended as he was blessing the disciples; the fruits of his invocation were quickly seen at Pentecost, and they continue to enrich and gladden the Church.

III. THE EFFECT IT PRODUCES. 1. *Enthusiasm.* The people "shouted" for joy and thanksgiving, they gave utterance to their admiration and excitement. That Jehovah should condescend thus to visit his children, that the Infinite One should so openly reveal himself! The coldest are warmed into emotion, the hardest surfaces yield, the sternest natures cannot repress exclamations of astonishment when they perceive the signs of a presence more than mortal. 2. *Reverence.* "They fell on their faces," to worship. Awe filled their minds and prostrated their bodies. Never should excitement lead to forgetfulness of the respect due to God. And if it be otherwise, there is reason to suspect the genuineness of the professedly Divine exhibition of approval. We may fear lest the fire has been begotten not of heaven but of earth.

CONCLUSION. Will any refuse to behold in Christ "the brightness of the Father's glory"? Here "all" the people saw the glory. Age, sex, or rank no hindrance. There may be a difference in the apprehension of the significance of the spectacle, but it should awaken gratitude and veneration in every breast.—S. R. A.

Vers. 1-7.—*The eighth day.* There is sacred mystery in the numbers of Holy Scripture well worthy of attention. We have an example before us.

I. ON THIS DAY THE CONSECRATIONS WERE COMPLETED. 1. *The eighth is a day signalized by sanctity.* (1) All children were, according to the Law, in the uncleanness of their birth until the eighth day. Then they received circumcision, and thenceforward were recognized as holy, having the seal of the covenant or purification of God upon them (ch. xii. 2, 3). (2) The young of beasts, in like manner, were ceremonially unclean before their eighth day. They were therefore unfit to be offered as sacrifices. But on the eighth day and thenceforward that unfitness ceased; they were accounted clean (ch. xxii. 27). (3) Persons unclean through leprosy, or through any issue, or a Nazarite in case of accidental defilement by the dead, all had to abide seven days in uncleanness. The eighth day, in all such cases, was memorable as that upon which they were accounted clean (ch. xiv. 8-10; xv. 13, 14; Numb. vi. 9, 10). (4) So here, the tabernacle, the altar, all the vessels of the ministry, together with the priests, were seven days in the process of purification, and on the eighth day the purity of all became established (comp. Ezek. xlivi. 26, 27). 2. *These things point to gospel times.* (1) The pollutions of the birth refer to original sin. This, in the case of the children, is so obvious as to need no comment. The reason of the law of uncleanness in relation to the young of animals is that in the Levitical system they were made representatives of human beings. (2) The pollutions of adults would stand for sins committed "after the similitude of Adam's transgression." (3) All were "purged with blood," the

blood of circumcision or that of animal sacrifices, which anticipated that precious blood of Christ by which we are redeemed from "all sin." 3. *But what has this to do with the "eighth day"?* (1) The eighth day remarkably characterizes the gospel. Since in the week there are seven days, the "eighth" day and the "first" are obviously the same. Now, it was on the "first day of the week" that Jesus rose from the dead (Matt. xxviii. 1). On the first day he seems to have several times appeared to his disciples during the forty days of his sojourn on the earth after his resurrection. On the first day he ascended into heaven, if we take the "forty days" to be clear days. The memorable day of Pentecost is calculated to have fallen upon the first day of the week. The early Christians kept the first day sacredly, as the seventh had been by the Jews (see Acts xx. 7; 1 Cor. xvi. 2). This was called "the Lord's day" (Rev. i. 10), just as our Eucharist is called "the Lord's Supper," because he instituted it. (2) But why should the eighth day have been chosen thus to characterize the gospel? This question may be better answered as we proceed to notice—

II. THAT ON THIS DAY THE LORD WAS TO APPEAR. (Ver. 4.) 1. *This promise had an immediate fulfilment.* The Shechinah that had been in the thick darkness of the most holy place, shined forth in brightness upon the people (ver. 23). 2. *It had a fuller accomplishment in the gospel.* (1) Christ is the true Shechinah (comp. Isa. xl. 5 with Matt. iii. 3; see also Matt. xvii. 2; John i. 14; ii. 11; xi. 40; xiv. 9; 2 Cor. iv. 4; Col. i. 15; Heb. i. 3). (2) The Shechinah also appeared after our Lord's ascension, viz. in the wonders of the memorable day of Pentecost. 3. *The crowning manifestation is reserved to the great day.* (1) Then Jesus will be revealed "without sin." He will not then appear amid circumstances of humiliation, as in his first advent. (2) He will be revealed "in all his glory." (a) "His own," Messiah's, glory. (b) That of "his Father," as "the God of glory." (c) "With the glory of his holy angels," who attend the "King of glory" as his retinue. 4. *This will be the glory of the eighth day.* (1) The six days of the creation week are supposed by Barnabas to represent six chiliads, or periods of a thousand years, during which the world is to be in toil and sorrow. The sabbath at the end of these represents the thousand years of John (Rev. xx. 6), distinguished as "*the Millennium.*" The Rabbi Elias and other authorities are cited in favour of this view; and it is countenanced by the course of the fulfilment of prophecy. (2) At the close of this age is the final judgment, which introduces a still more glorious state, described as "a new heaven and a new earth" (see Rev. xxi. and xxii.). This, then, is the eighth day. As the Millennium (Rev. xx.) is the fulfilment of the Jewish sabbath, so is the superior blessedness to follow the fulfilment of the Christian (Heb. iv. 6—9, margin). Then will everything in earth and heaven be consecrated.

III. THEN WILL THE VALUE OF THE GREAT SACRIFICE APPEAR. 1. *As averting the evils of sin.* (1) Who, without the purification of the gospel, can encounter the brightness of that Epiphany (Mal. iii. 2)? (2) But those who possess this purity need have no fear of the horrors of the "outer darkness" (Rev. xxi. 7, 8; xxii. 14, 15). 2. *As procuring ineffable bliss.* (1) The consecration of the eighth day resulted from the ceremonies of the days preceding. So will the purity of the heavenly state rise out of the tragedies and horrors of Calvary. (2) The summoning of the sacrifices on the eighth day was, amongst other things, to witness this. All were summoned, viz. sin, burnt, peace, and bread offerings. In the blessings of the gospel we have all that was foreshadowed by Levitical oblations of every kind. (3) The song of Moses and of the Lamb will swell the rapture of heaven.—J. A. M.

Vers. 8—24.—*Aaron's first priestly services.* Moses officiated as the priest of the Lord until the consecration of Aaron and his sons was completed. Now they enter upon their functions, and the verses recited furnish us with an account of their first services. In reviewing these we notice—

I. THE OFFERINGS. 1. *Aaron's offering for himself.* (1) The Jews say this was intended to make atonement for his sin in connection with the golden calf. Possibly this may have been so; for we have no record elsewhere of any formal atonement for that offence. Aaron, doubtless, had many offences to atone for. The sacrifice of Christ is not only for sins, but also for sin. (2) Aaron's own hands slew this victim. What a graphic confession of sin was this! What an unequivocal acknowledgment of his

deserving to die! Our confession of sin before God should be with deep conviction and reality. (3) He put the blood upon the horns of the altar. These were fronting the veil, behind which was the ark of the covenant and the glory of the Lord. This putting of the blood with the finger before the face of God was, as it were, pointing it out to him, calling his attention to it. So should the faith of the sinner point out to God's mercy the blood of the cross which satisfies his justice. (4) Aaron's sons served with him at the altar. They brought the blood to have it sprinkled. This was the confession of their part in the guilt of their father. Guilt is hereditary and relatively distributive (see Numb. xvi. 32, 33; Josh. vii. 24, 25). It was also an expression of their faith in the blood of the common Redeemer. (5) This offering of Aaron for his own sin before he could offer for the people suggests the imperfection of the Levitical priesthood, and therefore the necessity of the priesthood of the gospel (see Heb. v. 3; vii. 26—28; ix. 7—14). 2. *The offerings for the people.* (1) Aaron himself slew also these victims (vers. 15, 16). This he did as the representative of the people. Individuals were directed to slay their own victims (comp. ch. i. 5, 11; iii. 4, 8, 13). But these were for the congregation. (2) The sons of Aaron helped him here also. They "presented unto him the blood, which he sprinkled upon the altar round about." They also brought the fat of the inwards to him (vers. 18—20). This was suggestive of the nature of the Levitical priesthood, which was destined to pass from hand to hand. The comparison here is favourable to the priesthood of Christ, which is "unchangeable" (Heb. vii. 23—25). (3) The breast and shoulder were waved and heaved, and afterwards came to the lot of Aaron and his sons. Here we are taught that it is God's order that "they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel" (see 1 Cor. ix. 13, 14; Matt. x. 10).

II. THE BLESSING. 1. *The blessing from the altar* (ver. 22). (1) As Aaron, standing upon the altar, pronounced his first blessing upon the people, this shows the Source from whence all blessing springs. Even in heaven, the Great Sacrifice of the altar of Calvary will be the burden of the song of the redeemed (Rev. v. 9—14). (2) In blessing, Aaron acted as the type of Christ, who, while he moved about upon this earth, which was the altar of his sacrifice, dispensed blessings in a thousand forms. Witness (a) the beatitudes in the Sermon on the Mount. (b) The miracles of beneficence. (c) His official benedictions. (3) As Aaron, standing upon the altar, lifted up his hands, blessed the people, and then went into the holy place, so Jesus, standing on the Mount of Olives, after lifting up his hands and blessing his disciples, ascended into the holy place of the heavens (comp. Luke xxiv. 50, 51). 2. *The blessing from the holy place.* (1) Coming forth from the holy place, Aaron again blessed the people. The words of the benediction are given in Numb. vi. 23—27. Between these and those of the apostolic benediction, which sets forth the genius of the gospel, there is remarkable correspondence (see 2 Cor. xiii. 14). (2) In response to this second benediction, "the glory of the Lord appeared unto all the people." We are here reminded how Jesus, before ascending into heaven, encouraged his disciples "not to depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father," and how, "when the day of Pentecost was fully come," that promise was verified. (3) "And there came a fire out from before the Lord," etc. (ver. 24). This was the emblem of the Holy Spirit, whose baptism, like fire, searches into substances, while water can only wash the surfaces (Matt. iii. 11, 12). So in the baptism on the day of Pentecost, tongues of flame sat on the disciples (Acts ii. 3). (4) The consuming of the fat of the inwards on the altar by the sacred fire foreshadowed how the body of our sins is destroyed in the sacrifice of Christ, who, "through the Eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot to God" (Heb. ix. 14). It also describes the manner in which the wicked will be treated who persist in their rebellion against God (Ps. xxxvii. 20). Those whose sins are not consumed in the fires of love will themselves be consumed in the fires of wrath.—J. A. M.

Vers. 1—6.—*Appearing together before God.* It is true that we are always "in the presence of the Lord." "He is not far from any one of us." "He compasses our path and our lying down: he besets us behind and before." There is no man who at any moment may not use the prophet's words, "The Lord, before whom I stand." But it is also true that God would have us place ourselves consciously and in company before him; that we should gather together at his house and worship in "his holy temple." We gain thoughts on this subject from our text, viz.—

**I. GOD'S CALL TO HIS OWN PRESENCE.** (Vers. 5, 6.) It was at the Lord's own command that "all the congregation drew near and stood before" him. The entire scene was due to explicit Divine direction. It is God himself who calls us to his presence. We may venture to ask why he does so, and to answer by suggesting: 1. That it is a part of his Divine satisfaction in us to receive our united homage and thanksgiving; and 2. That he knows that public worship is best suited to impress our minds and strengthen our souls in heavenly wisdom. But we are certain that *it is his will*, for whatever reasons. "Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together," etc. (Heb. x. 25; see Acts ii. 42). The presentation of ourselves before God should be measured thus: (1) multiplied by (a) our sense of God's pleasure with our worship; (b) our need of spiritual refreshment and elevation; (c) usefulness to others by way of encouragement in piety. (2) Limited by home duties and the other claims of our outer life.

**II. THE HUMAN INSTRUMENT IN THIS SACRED SUMMONS.** (Vers. 1, 3.) Here we have a double human instrumentality: Moses called Aaron, etc. (ver. 1), and Aaron was instructed to take on himself the duty of summoning the children of Israel to bring their sacrifices before the Lord (ver. 3). God continually speaks to us through man. Some men are his spokesmen in an especial sense and in a large degree; all of us are to be listeners to those who speak in his name. Those who speak for him are to be faithful and earnest in summoning his people to "stand before the Lord." Does the prophet ask, "What shall I cry?" Surely, one answer of the heavenly voice is, "O come, let us worship and bow down: let us kneel before the Lord our Maker" (Isa. xl. 6; Ps. xcvi. 6; see Ps. c. 2, 3, 4).

**III. THE SPIRIT IN WHICH WE SHOULD RESPOND.** We should come before the Lord: 1. In a spirit of *humility*. Aaron himself was to take a sin offering (ver. 2), and this after all the sacrifices described in the preceding chapter. The people also were to present a sin offering (ver. 3). Though we may be in a state of reconciliation with God, we have need of the spirit of penitence at all times, and, when we draw near to the throne of grace, should ask that the mercy of God in Jesus Christ may cover our offences and shortcomings. 2. In a spirit of *consecration*. Aaron was to take a ram for a burnt offering (ver. 2); the people a calf and a lamb for the same kind of sacrifice (ver. 3). They were—as we are—to be ready to consecrate themselves unto the Lord, to offer themselves in spiritual sacrifice on his altar. We are to go up to God's house ready to renew our vows unto him. 3. In a spirit of *gratitude and joy*. The children of Israel were not to omit the meat offering or the peace offering (ver. 4). We are to take with us before God a heart full of thanksgiving for his bounty; also of social, sacred joy. We are to rejoice together before him. 4. In a spirit of *devout expectation*. The Hebrew worshippers were to look for the manifestation of Jehovah: "To-day the Lord will appear unto you" (ver. 4). We, too, are to expect that God will be with us; that he will draw nigh unto us when we draw nigh unto him (Jas. iv. 8); that Christ our Lord will "manifest himself unto us," will "come unto us, and make his abode with us" (John xiv. 21—23).—C.

**Ver. 7.—Sacrifice for sin.** We may look first at our subject simply as an incident in human history, apart from the consideration of its place in the inspired record. Then we have—

**I. A REPRESENTATIVE SCENE IN THE HISTORY OF MAN.** The most eminent civilian in the nation says to the most eminent ecclesiastic, "Go unto the altar, and offer thy sin offering, . . . and make an atonement for thyself, and for thy people." Under every sky, in every age, we have the sad, solemn facts of which these words are the expression. 1. Man conscious of sin, saying, "I ought" and "I ought not," knowing in his heart that he has done that which should have been left undone, and has omitted to do that which he should have done; with the language of conscious guilt upon his lips. 2. Man seeking reconciliation with an offended God, feeling and owning that, in addition to other duties, and even above all other considerations, he must seek and find a way by which God, by which the Supreme Power, may be conciliated. 3. Man seeking restoration by sacrifice; practically acknowledging that death is due to sin, dramatically appealing to the offended Power to accept the life of the slain animal instead of his own; "making atonement" for sin. The priest at the altar is a picture which all nations have presented—a picture of humanity conscious of its guilt seeking

mercy and restoration, hoping to attain it by a substitutionary sacrifice. The want is deep and wide; how shall it be met? It was met, in the first instance, by the ritual under the Law, by—

II. GOD'S TEMPORARY PROVISION. "The Lord commanded" Moses to say to Aaron, "Go unto the altar," etc. This act of religious service was done by Divine direction. Elsewhere men were blindly groping after him, and endeavouring to find a way of approach and reconciliation. Here, in the wilderness of Sinai, was a people, the nucleus of a nation, which "knew what it worshipped" (John iv. 22), which was taught of God himself. The Hebrew nation had been divinely instructed, and by its sacrifices declared: 1. That God had included all under sin, both priest and people, "for thyself and for the people." 2. That sin was deserving of death. 3. That a sin offering would be accepted by the merciful and righteous One. 4. That only a separated and holy man might approach the altar in sacrifice. 5. That the sin offering, having been presented and accepted, by the Holy One, all who would might, in sacred symbolism (the burnt offering), consecrate themselves to the service of a gracious God. But we must look further to—

III. THE DIVINE INTENTION WHICH LAY BEHIND. "This commandment of the Lord" was not *final*. It was adequate for the purpose. It was good for a time, for a dispensation; but it did not meet the wants of the race. Nor did it realize "the eternal purpose which he purposed" (Eph. iii. 11), nor exhaust the possibilities of the Divine wisdom and grace. "It is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sin" (Heb. x. 4). God would manifest his power and love in a far mightier way than this. 1. The altar should give place to the cross. 2. The victim from the herd and flock to the Lamb of God himself. 3. The fallible, changing priesthood to the holy, ever-living Saviour. 4. The many offerings continually repeated to the "one sacrifice for sins for ever" (Heb. x. 12).

1. With the pagan and the Jew, we share the common human consciousness of sin and need. 2. With the Jew, in distinction from the pagan, we have a divinely sanctioned method of approach and reconciliation. 3. With immeasurable advantage over Jew and pagan, we all have access at all times through the one Mediator, and can plead at every hour the one all-sufficient Sacrifice for sin. How great and high the privilege! How serious and solemn the responsibility!—C.

Vers. 8-21.—*The priest at the altar.* Aaron now enters on the great and high work to which he is appointed—that of God's chosen high priest. He "went unto the altar." As we follow him in that first official act (ver. 8) and see him, with the help of his sons (ver. 9), slaying the calf or the goat (vers. 8, 15), putting the blood on the horns, or pouring it at the bottom of the altar (ver. 9), we are reminded of fundamental truth which does not belong to one dispensation or one race, but to man everywhere and always.

I. THE SAD ASSUMPTION—UNIVERSAL GUILT. Some truths are rather assumed than enunciated in Scripture: this is one. Not that it is not stated (Rom. iii. 9, 23; Gal. iii. 22, etc.). But it is more often taken for granted. Thus in this scene. Aaron and his sons present sin offerings for themselves. It is assumed that there are not only "sinners of the Gentiles" needing mercy, but that the "holy nation" itself, the priestly family itself, nay, the high priest himself, is numbered among the sinful. This accords with our experience. 1. A large proportion of men are *notoriously*, presumptuously guilty; their lives proclaim aloud that they are transgressors against God. 2. Of the rest, a very large proportion are *confessedly* guilty; they allow freely that they have sinned by omission and commission. 3. The rest are *evidently mistaken* concerning themselves. If not apparent to human eye, it is obvious to the Divine that their lives are faulty and their souls stained. There is not one exception in the whole camp, in the entire congregation, in the nation, in the race. *All* have sinned, and need atonement.

II. THE FIRST DEEP NEED OF THE SOUL—DIVINE MERCY. The first sacrifice presented by Aaron for himself was "the calf of the sin offering" (ver. 8); the first for the people was "the goat which was the sin offering" (ver. 15). Man can do nothing in God's service till he is pardoned and accepted. "Forgiveness of sins" is the first great need of the soul, as it is the first great gift of the gospel (Luke xxiv. 47; Acts ii. 38;

xxvi. 18, etc.). "There is forgiveness with God, that he may be feared" (Ps. cxxx. 4). There would be no "fear," no reverence, no worship, no service of the Holy One, if forgiveness of sin were not attainable at once. That is the starting-point and condition of human devotion.

**III. THE ATTENDANT SPIRITUAL STEP—SELF-SURRENDER.** When Aaron had presented the sin offering for himself, he had not concluded his oblation; "he slew the burnt offering" also (ver. 12). So with "the people's offering" (vers. 15, 16). The significance of this second sacrifice was that the worshipper consecrated himself on the altar (to the service) of Jehovah. A perfect picture of sacred and abiding truth. We cannot go in humility and penitence, seeking mercy through Christ Jesus, without offering ourselves to him who has bought us with the price of his own blood. The soul longing for reconciliation with God offers itself freely in holy service unto him, lays itself on his altar, a "whole burnt offering unto the Lord." A living faith in Christ implies the eager taking of everything from him, and the cheerful giving of everything to him.

**IV. THE CERTAIN ISSUE—A BLESSED SPIRITUAL ESTATE.** A "meat offering" and "peace offerings" (vers. 17, 18) came after the other two. Sin forgiven, self surrendered, —then comes a sense of reconciliation, grateful acknowledgment of God's kindness, a holy joy in him (Rom. v. 1, 11). The assurance in the heart of Divine forgiveness, and the consequent surpassing peace and elevated joy, may not immediately follow. In the Divine life, the peace offering does not always come directly after the burnt offering. But it *will* come; it *does* come; and then, "oh, the blessedness of the man whose transgression is forgiven!" etc. (literal translation, Ps. xxxii. 1). "Seek, and ye shall find" (Matt. vii. 7).—C.

Ver. 22.—*Holy invocation.* This was an *imposing* act of piety, one which our imagination easily presents to our minds, and which affects us as profoundly interesting. The high priest, after solemnly and with holy awe offering the sacrifices of himself and the people, comes forth from the Divine presence, and with hands lifted up to heaven, utters, amid intense silence, the sacred words, "The Lord bless thee and keep thee," etc. (Numb. vi. 23—26). It was a scene fitted to subdue and sanctify the heart. It was also a *beautiful* act of piety. There is an admirable conformity to what is fitting and excellent in the nature of things, that the man who had gone with the people's burden of sin into the presence of God, and who had there sought and found for the people the Divine mercy, should, as he came from the holy place, bring to the people the blessing of the Most High. It was also an *instinctive* act of piety. It teaches us—

**I. THAT HE WHO WOULD BLESS HIS RACE MUST FIRST BE RIGHT WITH GOD.** Aaron could not have ventured on the holy invocation, if he himself had not been in the conscious enjoyment of the Divine favour. We must not expect to render any substantial religious service to our generation, if we have not ourselves returned unto our Father, and been reconciled unto him through Christ. Without all contradiction, the less is blessed of the better, and "he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than" any one who stands without.

**II. THAT THE NEARER A MAN IS TO GOD THE MORE EFFECTUAL IS HIS HOLY INVOCATION.** It was directly after offering sacrifice, and in close connection with that act, immediately after standing at the altar of Jehovah, that Aaron "lifted up his hand and blessed the people." It is not the official in the kingdom of Christ—all we are brethren—but it is the man who "walks with God," who "stands before God" continually, who "abides in Christ," who is "beloved of the Lord,"—it is he whose word of holy, earnest invocation will most avail to bless.

**III. THAT THERE ARE MANY UNKNOWN BENEFACTORS OF OUR RACE WHO BRING DOWN THE BLESSING OF GOD UPON US.** "More things are wrought by prayer than this world dreams of"—by *interceding* prayer, by the earnest, believing invocation of the holy. Who shall say what essential service some have rendered who have quietly and secretly brought down the blessing from on high? Perhaps the uplifting of holy hands in the silent chamber may have done more to end the great campaign which is lasting through the centuries, than some notable and noisy lives men talk much of.

**IV. THAT THOSE WHO HAVE INTERCEDING KINDRED SHOULD REALIZE THEIR SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITY.** They are the subjects not only of direct human influence, but of those Divine influences which are thus drawn down from above.

V. THAT CHRIST ALONE CAN CONFER THE PEACE WE NEED. “The Lord . . . give thee peace,” uttered the Hebrew priest (Numb. vi. 26). “Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you,” said the Lord from heaven (John xiv. 27). Aaron’s was a *human invocation*; Christ’s was a *Divine bestowal*. Aaron might hopefully invoke; Christ positively confers. “In him is life,” and all that makes life precious in the sight of God; it is in his right hand to bestow fulness of life on us. Let us be attracted to him, be attached to his service, abide in him, walk with him, and he will “*lay his hand upon us*,” and bless us with all those heavenly blessings which reside in him and are in his power to impart.—C.

Vers. 23, 24.—*The manifested presence.* The fulfilment of the Divine promise (ver. 6) by the manifested presence of Jehovah suggests—

I. ITS CONSISTENCY WITH OTHER DIVINE MANIFESTATIONS. God so revealed his presence when he did visibly appear to man, that there should be no delusion in the matter. None could, none did, mistake the “glory of the Lord” for the Lord himself (Exod. iii. 2; xxiv. 16, 17; xxxiii. 9; 2 Chron. vii. 1; 1 Kings xviii. 38; Isa. vi. 1).

II. ITS THREEFOLD SIGNIFICANCE. It plainly intimated: 1. God’s presence in the midst of the camp. 2. His acceptance of their sacrifice and his pleasure in his people. 3. His approval of the Aaronic appointment, and of the way in which his service had been conducted. This emphatically, for the time chosen was the first day on which the high priest had served at his altar.

III. ITS IMMEDIATE EFFECT ON THE MIND OF THE MULTITUDE. When “all the people saw,” they were incited to (1) rapturous delight: “they shouted;” and (2) reverential prostration: they “fell on their faces.” At such a vision reverence and joy mingled within them, and stirred their souls to intense spiritual emotion. A visible appearance, acting strongly on the soul through the senses, produces an immediate and powerful *present effect*. How deep it will descend, and how long it will last, depends on the sincerity, spirituality, fulness of the meditation, prayer, resolution, which follows the awe-inspiring spectacle. Far more depends on the wisdom with which the next hour (day) is spent, than on the excitements of the moment.

IV. ITS CHRISTIAN COUNTERPART. There is in the Christian dispensation: 1. The temporary miraculous element. Here we have, as the counterpart, the “cloven tongues like as of fire” (Acts ii. 3). 2. That that which is more important is the permanent supernatural element. Here we have the Divine illumination, the baptism of the Holy Ghost. Not the “glory of the Lord” visible to the eye, but the grace of God apprehended by the understanding mind; not the outward appearance, but the inward influence and indwelling; not the symbol of the Divine presence outside the tabernacle, but the very Spirit of the living God within the temple of the human body (1 Cor. iii. 16; vi. 19). When we go up to the house of the Lord to “behold the beauty of the Lord,” to “see his glory . . . in the sanctuary” (Ps. xxvii. and lxiii), we go up to behold no visible grandeurs, but to do that which is better far for all spiritual well-being: (1) to realize his nearness to us; (2) to learn and welcome his truth; (3) to pour out our hearts before him in adoration, praise, and prayer; (4) to open our souls to receive his indwelling, sanctifying Spirit.—C.

Vers. 1—24.—*Subject: God’s glory manifested in the blessedness of his people.* The priests enter upon their office, offer sacrifices for themselves and the people, and receive tokens of Jehovah’s presence and blessing. “*And Aaron lifted up his hand towards the people*,” etc. (vers. 22—24). The main facts described are: 1. The joint blessing of the mediator of the Law and the high priest on the people, the solemn conclusion of the consecration and inauguration. 2. The *glory of the Lord appearing* unto all the people. 3. The *fire* from before the Lord *consuming* the burnt offering and the fat. 4. The whole people beholding the sign, accepting it as from God, and rejoicing in it with adoring homage.

I. MAN BLESSED IN GOD. 1. *Religion as revealed and set forth* in the mediation of law and sacrifice, the only true element of fellowship between the creature and Creator. Natural religion spurious substitute and insufficient. Moses and Aaron both typical of him in whom God invites us to receive the fulness of grace. 2. The blessings pronounced and published. In the promises of Scripture, in the history of redemption, in

the individual experience of believers. Godliness hath the promise of both worlds in the best sense. Old and new covenants really one.

II. DIVINE GLORY MANIFESTED in response to man's faithfulness. 1. Look for it especially *in connection with the sanctuary*. After great confession and universal seeking of God's favour. An outpoured grace in revived religion, in manifest success in spiritual service, in the fellowship of priests and people with one another, in the providential signs of Divine interposition for the Church's extension. 2. *Unto all the people*. The blessing of religion is for the multitude, for the nation, for the world. Yet those who would see the glory must come around the centre of its manifestation in the holy place. We can see the glory of the Lord in creation, in providence, in the written Word, only as we are taught by the Spirit and recognize the true order of the Divine kingdom, which places the throne of righteousness, the mercy-seat, in the midst, and makes the glory to radiate from that.

III. RELIGIOUS JOY AND PRAISE stirred up by signs of grace, 1. Heartfelt and outspoken. 2. Uniting all in common exaltation. 3. Deeply humble and adoring. 4. Not dependent on external miracle, but finding occasion in every proof of fire from heaven, in the Church and in the world.—R.

### EXPOSITION.

#### CHAPTER X.

THE DEATH OF NADAB AND ABIHU, THE SONS OF AARON (vera. 1—7). The first day of Aaron's ministry had not yet closed. He had offered the sacrifice, and had entered into the holy place with Moses, and had returned to the court of the tabernacle, where the people had been standing in mute expectation, and God had shown his approval and his confirmation of him in his priestly acts by consuming the sacrifice, as they lay on the altar, with a miraculous fire emblematic of himself, when a rash act on the part of his two eldest children changed the day from one of rejoicing to one of mourning. It would seem that Nadab and Abihu, being already in a state of exaltation from the events of the day, in which they had taken so prominent a part, felt bound, when the fire came forth from God, and the people shouted and fell on their faces, to take some step whereby to acknowledge on the part of the people the graciousness displayed so visibly by the Lord. Moses and Aaron had been parted from them when they went into the tabernacle, and were now facing the congregation, the ministers rather of God to man than of man to God, and Nadab and Abihu appear to have regarded themselves as the representatives of the people. Without waiting for instructions, they rose from their prostration, and, preparing to make a return to God for his gift of fire by the offering of incense sym-

bolical of prayer, they lit their censers from one of the fires which had been made for boiling the sacrificial flesh, and, putting incense upon them, started forward, with the intention of carrying the burning incense to the golden altar of prayer in the holy place. They reached the door of the tabernacle, where Moses and Aaron were standing, when they were met by a blast of the same fire which had already swept to the brazen altar, and they fell dead. They had acted presumptuously. They had not, like Eleazar and Ithamar, waited for the Divine command, but, in their haste, they had irreverently broken the custom, which rested upon a Divine command, of taking the fire for the altar of incense from the altar of burnt sacrifice alone. The fact that this offence was the transgression of a positive rather than of a moral precept, would have made the lesson the more complete and emphatic. They—the newly ordained priests—had, with whatever good intentions, done what God had not commanded, and in doing it had done what he had forbidden. Like Uzzah afterwards (2 Sam. vi. 7), they died for it, that others might fear to do the same. Will-worship (Col. ii. 23) received thereby an emphatic condemnation, and priests and people were taught, in a manner not to be forgotten, that “to obey is better than sacrifice” (1 Sam. xv. 22).

Ver. 1.—Nadab and Abihu are said to have each taken his censer. This is the

first time that the word used in the original is translated "censer." It means any vessel or pan that will hold embers or tinder (see Exod. xxv. 38; xxvii. 3, 23; xxviii. 3). They put fire therein, and put incense thereon. No doubt they used the incense ordered in Exod. xxx. 34. They are not found fault with for the incense, but for the fire that they used. They offered strange fire, that is, fire not taken from the altar of burnt offering, which they might have feared to approach after the miracle that had occurred. In ch. xvi. 12 it is ordered that, on the Day of Atonement, the incense fire should be taken from the brazen altar, and this was no doubt the rule on all occasions, though the law has not been recorded.

Ver. 2.—And there went out fire from the Lord, and devoured. These are the exact words used in ch. ix. 24 of the fire that consumed the sacrifices. The fire was the same; its source was the same; its effect was the same, and yet how different! They died before the Lord; that is, they were struck dead at the door of the tabernacle.

Ver. 3.—This is that the Lord spake (see Exod. xix. 22; xxviii. 41; xxix. 44; ch. viii. 33). God will be sanctified either by the obedience or by the punishment of those that come nigh him, that is, his priests. If they have greater privileges, they have greater perils (cf. Matt. xi. 21). Aaron held his peace—in submission (see Ps. xxxix. 9; Job i. 22), acknowledging that Moses had justified the act of God in executing so terrible a judgment.

Ver. 4.—Uzziel was the youngest brother of Amram (see Exod. vi. 18-22). His sons, Mishael and Elzaphan, were therefore second cousins of Nadab and Abihu, who are here called their brethren. (Cf. the use of the term "brothers of the Lord," applied probably to his first cousins in the New Testament.)

Ver. 5.—They went near, and carried them in their coats out of the camp. Their coats were the tunics which they had put on as their priestly attire (ch. viii. 13). The lightning flash which had struck them down had not injured their clothes. As Mishael and Elzaphan became ceremonially defiled by contact with the corpses, and as the Passover was now at hand, it has been thought that it was in reference to their case that the concession was made, that those defiled by a dead body might keep the Passover on the fourteenth day of the second instead of the first month (Numb. ix. 6-11). The defilement caused by death ceased when Christ had died.

Ver. 6.—Uncover not your heads. They are to abstain from all the conventional signs of mourning, in order to show that they acknowledged the justice of the punishment. The whole house of Israel, that is, the people in general, might mourn the death of their priests, but the high priest and his remaining sons must prove their submission to the Divine chastisement by crushing their individual feelings of sorrow. A murmur on their part would have brought God's wrath on themselves and on the whole congregation, which they represented (ch. iv. 3). *Uncover not your heads* may be otherwise translated, *Let not your hair fall dishevelled* (see ch. xxi. 10).

Ver. 7.—The priests are not to be taken away from their duties at the door of the tabernacle, that is, the court in front of the tabernacle, even for the sake of burying their dead. They had now been in the court for eight days continuously, and they had to remain there until, in the fulfilment of their public function, they had eaten the sacrificial meal. Cf. Matt. viii. 21, 22, "Lord, suffer me first to go and bury my father. But Jesus said unto him, Follow me." God's service comes before all things.

#### HOMILETICS.

Ver. 1, 2.—*The sinfulness of man mars the full effect of the good purposes of God on the very day of the consecration of the priests.*

I. **THE SIN OF NADAB AND ABIHU.** Presumption. They chose their own method of returning thanks and giving praise to God, a method unsanctioned by God's command, unauthorized by their official superiors.

II. **THEIR PUNISHMENT.** Death. We might have thought that a lesser penalty would have sufficed for such a sin, if we had not had their example before us.

III. **ITS LESSONS.** 1. *The necessity of obedience to positive precepts as well as moral commands.* Moral commands, which rest for their basis on some reason which we can apprehend, being in their nature of far greater importance than positive precepts, which are binding simply because they have been ordered, we are tempted to undervalue the latter. We say, "I know God's purpose, and will carry it out; it is slavish to be bound by the letter. He will prefer the course which has now become the best to that which he commanded under perhaps altered circumstances." This arises

from pride. We make ourselves judges of God's purposes, in respect to which we are in truth ignorant or can at best guess blindly. There may be a thousand other objects of the Divine counsels beside that which we think that we see, which we regard as the only one. The questions which alone we must ask are, "Does this injunction come from God? and does it affect me?" If so, we must obey it without respect to consequences, and we may not substitute for it a course of action which appears to ourselves better adapted to effect the end which we suppose to be in view. 2. *The special necessity of this obedience in Divine worship.* God knows how he wills to be worshipped, and why he should be so worshipped. Man does not. Under the old dispensation, the forms of worship appointed by him were typical. What they were typical of he knew, but man did not; therefore man could not judge of their propriety. Under the new dispensation, he has by positive injunction appointed two rites—the sacrament of Baptism and the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. To dispense with either of them would be an act of the highest presumption. He appointed certain forms by which they were to be administered. Human authority may not in baptism change water for any other element, or substitute other words than those appointed, nor may it alter the form of the consecration in the administration of the Holy Communion; nor when Christ has said, "Drink ye all of this," may it, without sin, enjoin, "Ye shall not all drink of it." 3. *Human authority to be obeyed where God has not spoken.* There must be regulations of some kind for Divine worship, and these it is the office of the Church to supply, ordaining, abolishing, and changing, as it seems good from time to time. "Every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain . . . ceremonies or rites of the Church;" and also "to change and abolish" them when "ordained by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying" (Art. XXXIV.). When once ordained, they have a binding force over the conscience until abolished by the same authority. "Whosoever through his private judgment, willingly and purposely, doth openly break the tradition and ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnant to the Word of God, and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly (that others may fear to do the like), as he that offendeth against the common order of the Church, and hurteth the authority of the Magistrate, and woundeth the consciences of the weak brethren" (Ibid.). Although the intention be good, though the purpose be to improve the worship of God, and, as in the case of Nadab and Abihu, to light up in the sanctuary the golden altar of incense and prayer, yet, if a man act without the authority of his Church, he is guilty of presumption, and will have to bear his iniquity.

Ver. 2.—*Fire* was the instrument of the destruction of Nadab and Abihu, whilst just before it had been the means of consuming the sacrifice, and in passing to the altar it had probably bathed Moses and Aaron in its harmless flames as they stood at the door of the tabernacle. Thus it is that the same thing serves as a means of glorification or of destruction, according to the qualities of that with which it comes in contact. The discipline of daily life makes one a saint, another a more determined sinner. The discipline of suffering softens one heart, hardens another. The difficulties of religious belief make one the more submissive, another an unbeliever. God is the joy of the believer and the misery of the infidel. And so we may suppose that it will be hereafter. The presence of God will be the exceeding great reward of those who have sought him, and that same presence would be the torture of those who have not submitted their wills to his. It may be that this in itself will be sufficient to constitute the punishment of the unrighteous in the world to come.

Ver. 3.—*Increase of privilege involves increase of danger.* The nearer men are brought to God, the more liable they are to chastening at his hands. This is more particularly the case with those who are made his ministers. What might pass unpunished in others will be punished in them. What would be allowed in others will not be allowed in them (ver. 6). Had Nadab and Abihu not been called to be priests, they would not have met their untimely fate; and had Aaron, Eleazar, and Ithamar been laymen, they would have been permitted to make use of the ordinary signs of mourning for their dead. But God's work must come before any other duty, and if it be not done as God has willed it to be done, a sorcer punishment will fall upon those

who have specially devoted themselves to the immediate service of God than on others. This is a solemn thought for those who are ordained to be the ministers of God.

### HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

*Counterfeit fire.* Ch. x, 1-11; cf. Acts v. We have considered the consecration both of the high priest and of the minor priests, and how, entering upon their office in expectation of a sign, they got it in the outflash of the "consuming fire." But sad to say, two of the minor priests so provoke the Lord by their presumption that they are instantly consumed. Having already contrasted the high priest's consecration with Christ's baptism, and the descent of the fire with the effusion of the Spirit at Pentecost, we cannot resist the parallel presented by the case of Ananias and Sapphira to this case of Nadab and Abihu. If believers are rightly regarded as "priests unto God," then the case of Ananias and Sapphira is one of presumption in an assumed priesthood. The parallel will help us to definite ideas about the sin.

I. HONOUR IS OFTENTIMES TOO MUCH FOR SOME MINDS. And it is generally a minor class of mind that gets intoxicated with position and success. Nadab and Abihu, elevated to the priesthood, are so elated as to suppose that everything becomes them. Moreover, allied with this mental intoxication and excitement there often is physical intoxication. Indulgence is thought a proper thing for the upstart, and so he feeds his presumption by excess. The probabilities are in favour of supposing that Nadab and Abihu had indulged in wine or strong drink immediately on their elevation to the priesthood (cf. vers. 9, 10), and, in consequence, were incapacitated for distinguishing between the holy fire and its unholy counterfeit. It is not every one who can stand a "full cup," or walk with it steadily. If with honour there comes not a quiet spirit, it becomes a curse rather than a blessing.

II. SELF-CONFIDENCE IS THE NATURAL RESULT OF THE INTOXICATION OF SUCCESS. Nadab and Abihu, in their folly, think that they can guide themselves in priestly duty. Their venerable uncle, Moses, is not to be consulted by such dignitaries as they are. They can approach the Divine presence in a perfectly new and original way. The fire which came originally from heaven, and which has been most carefully preserved as a sacred deposit, is not, they believe, a bit better than fire they themselves can kindle. They will not depend upon it, but furnish a good fire themselves. Their spirit is self-confidence all through. The licence of innovation was most uncalled for at such a time, seeing that the ritual was only in process of reception from heaven. There was no excuse for their course at all.

III. GOD NEVER GRANTS A MANIFESTATION, BUT SATAN GETS UP THROUGH SELF-CONFIDENT MEN A COUNTERFEIT. Nadab and Abihu believed they could produce as good a fire as God. Ananias and Sapphira believed that hypocrisy could conduct itself as creditably as Pentecostal devotion. To every suggestion of a "year of grace," there comes the counter-suggestion of a "year of delusion." All fire is equally common, or, for that matter, equally sacred, to the self-confident mind. Special inspirations are incredible. Censers can be filled on the most rational principles, and God does not refuse any man's person.

Paul, in 1 Cor. xiii., conveys the idea of counterfeit eloquence, a loveless exhibition of oratory that casual observers might pronounce angelic; of counterfeit enthusiasm, and even faith, so that neither mysteries nor mountains can retard the loveless spirit's prayers; of counterfeit martyrdoms, giving up the body to be burned after giving up fortune to the poor; and yet, because love is wanting in such cases, they constitute an unacceptable and profitless service.

IV. THOSE WHO PRESUME WITH THEIR COUNTERFEITS MUST ACCEPT OF THE JUDGMENT THEY DESERVE. Nadab and Abihu, despising the Divine fire, and coming into competition with their own, are consumed by it. In a moment they experience how God is a "consuming fire" to all presumption. Ananias and Sapphira feel the same. They fall before the deserved vengeance of the Most High. God offers us the great alternative—either sanctification through the fire of the Holy Ghost, or destruction from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power. God will be sanctified in some way:

if the wrath of man does not turn to praise, it will glorify God in being restrained (Ps. lxxvi. 10).

V. IT IS CLEAR THAT GOD ONLY ACCEPTS WHAT HE HIMSELF INSPIRES. This is the lesson of this sad providence. We must bring back to God what he has given. Independent offerings are not acceptable. To come to him in a way of our own devising, instead of by Jesus Christ; to come to him in a self-confident spirit, instead of in the humility inspired by the Holy Ghost; to come to him with proud, cold hearts, instead of with warm and ardent ones, is to be sent empty away. He refuses all such counterfeit offerings; he must have Divine fire or none.—R. M. E.

*Submission in bereavement.* Ch. x. 8-7; 12-20; cf. 2 Sam. xii. 15-23; Job i. 18-21; John xi.; 1 Thess. iv. 13-18. The conduct of Aaron under the bereavement is most instructive. He holds his peace and is prepared to do whatever Moses commands. And here we have to notice—

I. GOD'S SERVICE AND GLORY MUST TAKE PRECEDENCE OF EVERY OTHER CONSIDERATION. The surviving priests were to leave the mourning and the funeral arrangements to their brethren. The bereavement is not to interfere with their priestly service and consecration. God asserts his claims as paramount. "He that loveth father or mother more than me," said God incarnate, "is not worthy of me: and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me" (Matt. x. 37). It is ideally possible, therefore, to be so filled with a sense of consecration to God that every other consideration is made to dwindle into insignificance. Is not this what we shall realize in heaven?

II. SUBMISSION TO GOD'S CLEARLY EXPRESSED WILL IS A RELIEF TO THE SOUL WHICH HAS BEEN UNCERTAIN BEFORE IT. The thought that God willed the death of those dear to us, has a wonderfully calming influence upon us. We may see no reason for the stroke, and God may not for a long season show us his reason, but we can believe he has one and a good one, and that "he doeth all things well." The death of Nadab and Abihu was as clearly a token from God as the previous manifestation. Job, again, shows the same submissive spirit under a still greater bereavement (Job i. 18-21). So did David on the death of his child (2 Sam. xii. 15-23). So did Mary and Martha on the death of Lazarus (John xi.). All these worthies rested, as we all may rest, and there is no other rest but in the will of an all-wise God. Uncertainty is trying, but even the certainty of bereavement and of sorrow has an element of rest in it.

III. AARON IS CAUTIONED AGAINST ANY USE OF WINE OR STRONG DRINK WHEN ENGAGED IN PRIESTLY SERVICE. Doubtless the primary significance of this injunction was, as already noticed, that Nadab and Abihu had erred therein. But it seems to carry also a beneficial caution. For at no time are people more tempted to resort to wine and strong drink than when in bereavement. A little stimulus, they fancy, will sustain them. So they take to "the bottle" to replenish their courage. The result is that they fall into deeper troubles than ever. Aaron is the better of this injunction to abstain at this time when his sorrow is so keen.

IV. SORROW NECESSITATED FASTING INSTEAD OF FEASTING. After the terrible trial, Aaron and his surviving sons had no appetite for the feasting to which they were entitled; and so they seem to have burned the sin offering in its entirety instead of eating of it. Moses, in directing the sorrowing priests to proceed to the feast of fellowship, made no due allowance for their condition. Aaron instinctively saw the incongruity of feasting when his heart was so sore, and therefore he acted in the spirit of the Law, which disposed of what could not be used in the fire of the altar.

And might not those who turn a house of mourning into a house of feasting learn a lesson of propriety here? Eating and drinking in connection with wakes and funerals have been carried oftentimes to most unseemly excess. The whole spirit of sorrow evaporates before the copious offerings to the "belly-god," and instead of spiritual profit there is spiritual deterioration.

Fasting is an effort of nature to say a word for the spirit within. Sorrow takes the edge off appetite, and rebukes feasting that the soul may have a season of repair. If the sad heart gets fair play, it will emerge from its sorrows purified and elevated.

V. THE SPIRIT MAY SOMETIMES MOST PROPERLY SUPERSEDE THE LETTER. We have seen how fatal was the innovation of the presumptuous priests. But in this same

chapter we come across an innovation on the part of Aaron, at which Moses and God were content. There is all the difference between rigidity which must not be broken, and a law whose spirit can move freely amid its forms. It was the latter which God gave. There are necessities which arise from time to time and are themselves laws to the spiritual mind. We should be jealous of ourselves in the exercise of our liberty, but, at the same time, we ought to realize our freedom as God gives it to us in his Law.

—R. M. E.

Vers. 1, 2.—*Disobedience swiftly punished.* What a contrast between the two scenes! Aaron and Moses entering the tabernacle and returning to bless the people and to participate in the rejoicing caused by the appearance of God's glory, and Nadab and Abihu approaching the same sacred place only to be consumed by the fire of judgment, their offerings rejected, themselves destroyed! The judgments of God are not pleasing to contemplate, but they are necessary to completeness of view, and to the begetting in us of due caution when we venture into his presence, lest our holy boldness degenerate into a presumptuous disregard of his regulations.

I. THE ACT OF RASH DISOBEDIENCE. 1. We see two brothers sinning against God. Brothers may be mutually helpful or injurious. To witness the union of members of a family in pious zeal is delightful, but too often relationship is provocative of harm rather than of blessing. Elder brothers, beware of leading your younger relations into sin! 2. Two that were intimately related to holy men were not thereby shielded from thoughtless action and severe judgment. Alas! that the children of godly parents should ever belie their ancestry. Here the sons of Aaron and nephews of Moses disdained their relationship. 3. Two young men brought destruction upon themselves and grief upon their friends. They died childless, and, if more than youths, could yet hardly have attained to any great age. Eleazar, the next brother, was perhaps not twenty at this time, for he was not included in the list of the men forbidden to see or enter the land of promise. We are apt to censure the evil deeds of young men too gently, and to look upon youth as more of an excuse than God seems here to regard it. Experience proves that if youth naturally inclines to sin, so also is it, equally with age, visited with righteous retribution. 4. Two that had been openly dedicated to the service of God were unmindful of his precepts. They had just been consecrated as priests. This did not prevent them from violating the Law, nor protect them from the consequences of their behaviour. There is danger as well as honour involved in waiting upon God. If Peter had not been called to the lofty position of discipleship, he had not denied his Master. By smiting these two priests, sons of the high priest, Jehovah taught the people that sin could be committed by, and would not be pardoned in, the most exalted of the nation. It was a conspicuous, forcible demonstration of the majesty and holiness of God. 5. Two that had recently beheld the glory of the Lord forgot the obedience their position demanded. Perhaps it was the very excitement consequent on such a scene that unduly elevated them, so that, becoming giddy, they reeled into the abyss of impetuous self-will and awful penalty. We must guard against imprudent familiar handling of Divine things after the grace of God has visited us with wondrous revelations of his mercy and favour. It is evident that even if displays of supernatural power were frequent, they would not prove a security against transgression. Some have turned the grace of God manifested in full and free salvation through Christ into a covering for licentiousness and irreverence.

II. THE GLOOMY CHANGE EFFECTED BY SIN. 1. *A day of hallowed joy becomes a day of mourning.* This is the bitter chequered experience of life. The sunny skies soon grow dark with clouds, the quiet waters are lashed into tempestuous fury. Men are almost afraid of seasons of ecstatic rejoicing, as if a reaction must quickly ensue; the gladness seems itself a presentiment of coming trouble. Sorrow treads close upon the heels of mirth. Sin may well excite in us sentiments of aversion when we see how it has disfigured the fair features of creation's landscape, changing songs into sighs and smiles into tears. Many a day that began with singing and prayer has ended with wailing and remorse. 2. *The fire of Divine approval is changed into the fire of Divine wrath.* The men became a sacrifice to God's glory indeed, but were not an offering voluntarily laid upon his altar. It seemed fitting that the punishment should bear an analogy to the sin. Strange fire was punished with hallowed fire. The conception of

a mild Deity unmoved to indignation at acts unaccordant with his will is not justified by Scripture, nor is it in harmony with the utterances of conscience or the testimony borne by the existent laws of his moral government of the world. *3. Not even the profession of desire to honour God excuses the wilful neglect of his injunctions.* To substitute human inventions for scriptural institutions is a dangerous practice. Reason may discern little difference of moment, but it is not safe to argue that therefore the particular observance is immaterial, and rests on no rational ground of distinction. The loyalty that will presume to alter the king's ordinances is of doubtful character and certain of rejection.—S. R. A.

Ver. 3.—*A bereaved parent.* Who can stand in the presence of death unmoved? A gulf separates us from the departed friend; the past is like a dream. The partnership between soul and body has been dissolved, and already the clay tabernacle, deprived of its tenant, shows signs of crumbling into decay. The form is the same, but the animating principle has fled. The casket has been rifled of its jewel; we survey the husk, but the kernel has vanished.

I. **HERE WAS AN INSTANCE OF SUDDEN DEATH.** This is the more startling. The festival is changed into a funeral. The active frame is motionless, the busy brain that teemed with thought is still; we call aloud, but there is no reply; we bend down to touch the lips, but we receive no responsive kiss. How weak is man, when a stroke deprives him of all his faculties, removes him from earthly ken, and his place knows him no more!

II. **IT IS SAD WHEN CHILDREN DIE BEFORE THEIR PARENTS.** Then the cup of bereavement contains an added element of bitterness. The natural order is inverted. Pathetic was the expression of Burke's grief at the loss of his only son. "I am stripped of all my honours; I am torn up by the roots, and lie prostrate on the earth, I have none to meet my enemies in the gate. They who ought to have succeeded me have gone before me. They who should have been to me a posterity are in the place of ancestors." To see the budding rose suddenly blighted, all the promise of life unrealized, is enough to rend a parent's heart with disappointment.

III. **IT IS SADDER STILL WHEN DEATH IS THE DIRECT RESULT OF THOUGHTLESS, SINFUL CONDUCT.** Then no gleam of light tempers the darkness. If the flower be transplanted to adorn the heavenly garden, there will be joy at the thought to alleviate the sorrow. But when the removal appears like that of tares to be burned, who shall assuage the pangs of bereavement? Children! strive so to live that if Providence call you away in early life, the memory left behind may be sweet and fragrant, pleasant and reassuring. *Let us not too hastily assume the death of the youthful to be a judgment.* We may have no Moses at our side, as here, to interpret the harrowing scene. We would not rush instantly to adverse conclusions, nor misconceive the dispensation. Even in the case before us we are not warranted in deciding upon the ultimate fate of Nadab and Abihu. Death is truly in every case *a particular instance of a general law.* "This is it that the Lord spake, saying, I will be sanctified," etc. It ever reminds us of its connection with sin, and every time we are called to stand by the grave we should be impressed with a deeper sense of the enormity and awfulness of sin in God's sight. Beholding the effect, let us hate the cause.

IV. Aaron furnishes **AN EXAMPLE OF FITTING BEHAVIOUR UNDER TRIAL.** He could not rejoice to see the withering of his cherished hopes; God expects no such unnatural triumphing over the instincts of affection. But he restrained from murmuring, he "held his peace." "I was dumb, I opened not my mouth, because thou didst it." Open the quivering lips, and the pent-up agony of the spirit may find vent in the utterance of expostulations and reproaches unworthy of a child of God. Job's wife tempted him to "curse God and die," but he "sinned not with his lips." He was, indeed, able to say, "Shall we receive good at the hands of God, and shall we not receive evil?" "The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the Name of the Lord." It was after this that he "uttered that he understood not."

V. **TO REPRESS REFINING IS ACCEPTED AS TACIT ACQUIESCE IN THE EQUITY OF DIVINE JUDGMENTS.** His ways are often mysterious, but his wisdom cannot err nor his love prove unkind. The greatest degree of affection for our fellow-creatures must never be allowed to lessen our supreme regard for the glory of the Creator. "It is

the Lord : let him do what seemeth him good." Listen to the voice from under the trees of the Garden of Gethsemane : " Father, not my will, but thine be done." Fond parents have sacrificed their children for the good of the commonwealth, how much more shall they be content to leave them in the hands of God, to be dealt with according to his infinite justice and mercy ! It was the glory of the Father that necessitated the surrender of his beloved Son to death for the redemption of the world.—S. R. A.

Vers. 6, 7.—*Restrictions and infirmities of religious service.* That honour involves responsibility is implied in many of these ordinances, and is recognized in the judgment passed on the conduct of men occupying conspicuous positions in society and in the Church. To be dedicated to God's service was an inestimable privilege conferred on Aaron and his family. Their time and labour were bestowed upon high and holy employments. The seal of God was stamped upon their brow, the people regarded them with respect and provided for their maintenance. Compare the honourable position of ministers, missionaries, yea, all the followers of Christ now, and note that there are special restrictions consequent upon their consecration, and common infirmities to which they are subject equally with others.

I. THE RESTRICTIONS. 1. *Forbidden to mingle with the world in its engagements.* " Not go out of the sanctuary," at least for a season, they are deprived of the liberty others enjoy. Pursuits which may be harmlessly indulged in by others are unbecoming to them. 2. *Prohibited from contact with all that is defiling.* They must not touch the dead bodies of their relations ; the cousins of Aaron shall perform the last offices for their brethren. What concord hath the Spirit of life with death ? To profane the holy unction is to incur the Divine displeasure. " Neither filthiness, nor foolish talking, nor jesting, which are not convenient." " Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness." 3. *Free manifestation of grief at God's visitations not permitted.* The usual relief found in expression is excluded ; there must be no signs of mourning upon the priests. Let it suffice for the nation to " bewail the burning." How shall the oil of gladness consort with mourning ? The people of God are not to be demonstrative in their sorrow at his chastisements, lest it be misconstrued, and others, taking occasion from their example, go further and even denounce the ways of God, and so " wrath come upon " them. We must remember the wisdom of the Almighty and the glory due unto his Name. Will not the world entertain hard thoughts concerning him if we his servants are over-loud in lamentation ?

II. THE INFIRMITIES which are not prevented. 1. *They are subject to the common losses and bereavements.* There is no special providence in this respect. Even Aaron and his sons have to bow before afflicting dispensations. If it were otherwise great part of the discipline of life would be omitted from the training of God's chiefest scholars. 2. *They also feel the natural pangs of sorrow.* It is evidently so in the present case, or the command to refrain from the usual manifestations of grief would not have been issued. God's ministers are not expected to become hard-hearted and callous, but they are not to give way to outbursts of anguish. 3. *They are liable to commit acts displeasing to God.* Nadab and Abihu are a solemn warning of the possibility of transgression. Even Christians of repute fall into grievous sin. They get hurried away by worldly passion, and offer unacceptable worship.

CONCLUSION. Observe the influence of our behaviour upon (1) the honour of God, and (2) the welfare of our fellows. He who expects great things of us will also, if we ask him, accord us the necessary strength to enable us to comply with his demands. Whilst conscious of the importance attaching to all our actions, we need not be depressed with a load of anxiety. We may " rejoice in the Lord alway."—S. R. A.

Vers. 1-7.—*Nadab and Abihu.* When the fire of God came upon the sacrifices, " the people shouted, and fell on their faces." While thus in an attitude of prayer, Nadab and Abihu snatched their censers, put fire into them, and put incense upon the fire, as though to send up the prayers of the people to God. In this they sinned, and in consequence paid a fearful penalty. Let us consider—

I. THE NATURE OF THEIR SIN. We are told: 1. *That they offered strange fire to God.* (1) The censers were right. They were doubtless those made under the direction of Bezaleel and Aholiab according to patterns shown in the mount (Exod. xxv.

40). (2) The composition of the incense also was right; we have no intimation to the contrary. Under proper conditions, therefore, the incense might appropriately ascend with the "prayers of the saints" (see Luke i. 9, 10; Rev. viii. 3, 4). (3) But the fire was wrong. It was a fire of their own kindling: not that which came forth from the Lord. It therefore represented their own spirit rather than the Spirit of God. No prayer can be acceptable that is not divinely inspired (see Isa. i. 10, 11; Rom. viii. 26, 27; Jas. iv. 3). It matters not how correct the form of words: the censer is nothing; or how orthodox the sentiment: the composition of the incense is nothing, without the sacred fire (1 Cor. xiii. 1, 2). 2. *That they acted without direction.* (1) This is the force of the words, "which he commanded them not." Their crime was not in doing what was forbidden, but in doing what was not enjoined. Will-worship is offensive to God. No body of uninspired men has any business to "decree rites and ceremonies." We should study the written Word to "prove what is that good and acceptable and perfect will of God" (see Deut. iv. 2; Prov. xxx. 6; Rom. xii. 2; Rev. xxii. 18, 19). (2) These transgressors were moved by a criminal pride. What had been done hitherto was done by Aaron, his sons only helping him; and done under the direction of Moses. They set divinely constituted authority at naught, which amounted to the despising of the authority of God. It was the very sin of Korah and his company (see Numb. xvi.). (3) They introduced confusion. One priest at a time should offer incense in order to foreshadow that One true Priest whose merits, as incense, invests with acceptable fragrance and gives direction to the prayers of the saints (see Psa. cxli. 2, margin; Rom. viii. 34; Heb. ix. 24; Rev. viii. 3, 4). Here two at once rush in. These foreshadow the confusion of that antichrist which would make "priests" and "saints" and "angels" rivals of the one only Mediator (1 Tim. ii. 5, 6).

II. THE LESSONS OF THE PUNISHMENT. 1. *God is not to be trifled with.* (1) He "will be sanctified in them that come nigh" to him (see Exod. xix. 22; Deut. xxxii. 48-51; Isa. v. 16; Ezek. xx. 41). (2) He is "a consuming fire." He will consume our sins in the sacrifice of Christ in his mercy, or he will make us a sacrifice and consume us in his anger. "He that believeth not shall be damned." 2. *His vengeance is often retributive.* (1) They sinned by fire; they suffered by fire (see Prov. i. 31; Isa. iii. 10, 11; Hos. viii. 11). (2) They preferred a fire of their own kindling to the fire of God; God's fire put their censers out, together with the light of their life. Twice we are reminded that they had no children, viz. Numb. iii. 4; 1 Chron. xxiv. 2. So completely was their light extinguished! "Quench not the Spirit." 3. *His retributions are sometimes summary.* (1) Their presumption was hasty and their destruction was swift (see 2 Pet. ii. 1). (2) They found "no space for repentance." They "died before the Lord," in presence of the mercy-seat, but finding no mercy. No wrath is more terrible than "the wrath of the Lamb." (3) As their sin foreshadowed that of the Babylonish antichrist, so did their punishment befallen his (see 2 Thess. ii. 3-8; Rev. xviii. 8). That judgment will be "before all the people." In it God will be signally "glorified." 4. *Mourning for the dead has its laws and limitations.* (1) It must not interrupt the service of God (vers. 6, 7; see Neh. vi. 3; Matt. viii. 21, 22; xii. 47-49). (2) "Aaron held his peace." Did not murmur against God. Moses soothed him by showing that it was a necessary act of justice. Wherein God is glorified we should be content. (3) It must not have expression in the holy place, which is a type of heaven. There the wisdom and justice of the judgments of God will be so manifest that the punishment of the wicked cannot be mourned. (4) But mourning is proper in the camp (vers. 4-6). The funeral procession through the camp of those corpses, wrapped in the very vestments in which the deceased too vainly gloried, would be an affecting sight. Nadab and Abihu, who had been in the mount, beholding the glory of the Lord (Exod. xxiv. 1), are now by wrath issuing from that same glory brought very low. When a king falls he often finds a scaffold at the foot of his throne. "Be not high-minded, but fear."—J. A. M.

Vers. 1-3.—*Sin and penalty in sacred things.* The story of the guilt and doom of the sons of Aaron constitutes a sad episode in the recital of the sacred precepts of the Law. We look at—

I. THE CHARACTER OF THE TRANSGRESSION. It appears (from ver. 16, compared with

ch. ix. 15) that this forbidden act was done very soon indeed after the solemnities described in the preceding chapter (ix.). Otherwise we should have inferred that it was familiarity with sacred rites which had bred irreverent unconcern, and issued in disobedience. We seem shut up to the conclusion that these young men, even when the solemn inaugural scenes were fresh in their memories, and the commandments of the Lord clearly before their minds, deliberately and wantonly took fire from another source than the heaven-kindled flame on the brazen altar (ch. ix. 24). Their action was, therefore, not only a defiant violation of the Law they had received from Moses, the servant of Jehovah, but it was a perverse diaregard of the manifest will of God, made known in special supernatural disclosure.

II. THE EXPLANATION OF THE PUNISHMENT. (Ver. 2.) This may seem severe, has seemed so to some. Why not exclusion from office or excommunication from the congregation of the Lord? Why the extreme penalty for one act of error in worship? The answer is manifold. 1. Their deed was (as has been said) an act of wilful and wanton disobedience. 2. It was committed by those who were in high position. 3. It was a sin on the part of men in the enjoyment of high privilege, and in the exercise of no slight influence. 4. It was an evil thing done in the holy place and before the very face of God; it was disobedience in connection with the public worship of Jehovah—the supreme sphere of activity, in regard to which it was of vital consequence to the nation that everything should be done aright. 5. One signal mark of high displeasure might be mercy as well as justice—inspiring holy awe and saving many others from similar transgressions.

III. THE LESSONS WHICH THE SIN AND THE PENALTY LEAVE BEHIND THEM. We learn from this solemn and painful scene: 1. That God's will must be sedulously regarded in our approaches to himself: "I will be sanctified in them that come nigh me" (ver. 3). 2. That God will vindicate his Law in unmistakable ways: "before all the people I will be glorified" (ver. 3). 3. That there is no exemption from exposure to temptation: not (1) sonship of the holy; (2) being in a holy place; (3) engagement in holy things; (4) recency of special privilege. 4. That the heinousness of sin depends on many things beside the nature of the overt act. 5. That between sin and suffering there will be found a striking correspondence. With fire they sinned, and by fire they were consumed. God makes meet penalty to overtake transgression: whatsoever a man sows, that he reaps (Gal. vi. 7). Sins against the soul lead to spiritual injury; against the body, to weakness, disease, and death; against society, to social dishonour and shame, etc.—C.

Vers. 1, 3.—"Strange fire." "I will be sanctified in them that come nigh me." *Great and small things in the worship of God.* Doubtless it seemed to Nadab and Abihu a matter of no consequence at all that they should take fire from one altar rather than from another. To us it may seem a comparatively *small* thing, when viewed in connection with the terrible doom that immediately ensued. Obviously, however, it was a *great* thing in the sight of God. The act of punishment by which he showed his high displeasure, and the words of the text, sufficiently prove this. The seriousness of this particular transgression on the part of the sons of Aaron arose from several attendant considerations (see Homily on "Sin and penalty," etc.): its seriousness to us, in the fact that we may be disregarding as small and insignificant that which, in God's sight, is great and even vital; that we may be approaching him with what we think acceptable service, when he is prepared to reject it as "strange fire," and condemn us severely for our disregard of his revealed will. In connection with the worship of God, there is—

I. THE APPARENTLY AND INTRINSICALLY SMALL. So far as the things themselves are concerned, it is of no consequence to that most High God "who dwelleth not in temples made with hands," what is (1) the style of architecture of our sanctuaries, (2) the character of their furniture, (3) the order of the services, (4) the number of ministrants who serve at pulpit or desk, (5) the particular text chosen for the day, etc. The judgment of good and faithful men may differ on these things, and their differences may be of no moment in the sight of God; in no way invalidating the service rendered, or lessening or lowering the blessing gained. But even in connection with the smaller matters, as also apart from that connection, there is—

**II. THE ACTUALLY AND INTRINSICALLY GREAT.** It is of the most serious importance that: 1. In all things, weightier and lighter, we should study to follow the will of Christ. His will is revealed in his own words, and in the acts and words of his apostles. Thence we must studiously deduce his desire concerning us. 2. We should make all things conduce to a reverential spirit. "God will be sanctified," etc. The service which does not tend to impress the worshipper with the greatness, majesty, holiness, wisdom, faithfulness of God, is fatally defective, is essentially faulty. 3. We should exalt Jesus Christ as a Saviour from sin. The prominence and priority given to the sin offering in this book point clearly to the truth that "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world" should have the principal place in Christian worship. He, the Divine Son, is also to be "sanctified in them that come nigh." 4. We should present the entire truth of revelation; not that part which we prefer, which falls in with our tastes or acquirements, but the "whole counsel of God." Guiltily disregarding these imperative matters, we (1) not only do not offer acceptable sacrifice, but (2) render ourselves obnoxious to our Master's Divine dissatisfaction, to his displacement of us from his service, to his severe rebukes (Rev. ii., iii.). The slightest deviation from the will of Christ, if caused by faulty negligence, and still more if due to wilful disobedience, is a serious transgression; on the other hand, faithfulness in small things, rendered cheerfully and in a loving spirit, is certain of Divine acceptance and approval.—C.

**Vers. 3—7.—*Self-restraint and utterance.*** "And Aaron held his peace," etc. The sequel to the sad story of the sin and death of Nadab and Abihu carries with it three lessons we shall do well to learn.

**I. THAT A MAN IS LESS HONoured BY EXALTED OFFICE THAN BY LOFTY ACTION.** We pay a certain respect to Aaron as the first high priest of the ancient Law, type of the "High Priest of our profession." But we pay a higher honour to him and feel a deeper regard for him, as one who acted nobly at a most trying time. Such a scene might well have unmanned him. We could not have blamed him had he given way to violent agitation, even in the house of the Lord. There is, in sorrow, a descending scale, and his was at the very bottom of its dark depths. Bereavement, the saddest of all losses; the death of a child, the saddest of all bereavements; the death of two sons in their manhood, the saddest form which the loss of children can assume; its startling, awful suddenness; its occurrence under the aggravating conditions of guilt and dishonour;—such was the staggering blow that fell on Aaron then! There is a nobleness of self-restraint which is truly touching, which excites our hearty admiration, in the fact that "Aaron held his peace." He did not give way to tempestuous emotion or to querulous complaint; he acted as became him: standing where he stood in the near presence of God, he bore the blow in sacred silence, he opened not his mouth, he was dumb, because he felt the Lord had done it (Ps. xxxix. 9). There is nothing manlier, nobler, more admirable than calmness in the overwhelming hour. It is born of (1) devoutness, a profound sense of the presence and sovereignty of God; and of (2) self-culture, the training of our own spirit, the "keeping of our heart" (Prov. iv. 23).

**II. THAT THE DEVOUT HEART WILL RECOGNIZE THE RIGHTNESS OF SUBORDINATING PERSONAL SENTIMENT TO THE SERVICE OF GOD.** (Ver. 6.) This melancholy occurrence had taken place in vindication of the honour of God (ver. 3). The one feeling which was to fill the hearts of those who stood before God was an unquestioning acceptance of the severe and afflictive decree of the Holy One. To show the ordinary signs of sorrow might be open to misconstruction; might appear as a protest against the death-penalty. In the cause of righteousness the natural feeling of father and sons must be energetically suppressed. And it was done. There come times in our history when, in the highest interests of all, in the service of God and of our kind, we are called upon to make parental, conjugal, fraternal, friendly emotions give place to calmness of spirit. When that hour comes, we, if we have Aaron's spirit, shall obey as he obeyed.

**III. THAT GOD DESIRES US TO GIVE PLAY TO HUMAN FEELING WHEN HIS LAW IS NOT BROKEN OR HIS SERVICE HINDERED THEREBY.** 1. The relatives of the dead were to carry their bodies decently and reverently "from before the sanctuary" (ver. 4). 2. The whole house of Israel were to "bewail the burning which the Lord had kindled" (ver. 6). Where the lamentation was natural, and where there was no peril

of its being misinterpreted, it was not only allowed but encouraged of God. Stoicism is no part of Christianity. We are to be natural and sympathetic. Jesus "rejoiced in spirit" and "wept" himself. He intimated his wish that we should act naturally, in accordance with our surrounding circumstances and inward spirit (Matt. ix. 15-17; John xvi. 20-22; Jas. v. 13). *Sympathetic* as well as natural: "rejoice with them that do rejoice, and weep," etc. (Rom. xii. 15).—C.

Vers. 1-7.—*Strange fire; and Jehovah's judgment upon it.* Ver. 3, "Then Moses said unto Aaron, This is that the Lord spake, saying, I will be sanctified in them that come nigh me, and before all the people I will be glorified. And Aaron held his peace."

I. A GREAT OFFENCE against the holiness of God. 1. *Defilement of his worship.* Violation of his written Word. Introduction of self-will and mere human device. Abuse of the joyful spirit of praise to insolent self-assertion and disregard of decencies and reverence. 2. Special profanation of the sanctuary by *disobedience of priests.* Holy offices dishonoured is a fearful evil. 3. *Hiding of God's glory* with false glory. Ritualism. Mere show of human talent. Abuse of music. Forgetfulness of God in his service. Temptation to vain-glory.

II. A SOLEMN VINDICATION of the sanctity of God's house and Law. Strange fire offended, true fire punished. 1. Profitableness of the study of providence, especially ecclesiastical history, as revealing the "consuming fire" of righteousness in the Church. 2. Representative character of all God's people, and especially those in prominent position. God glorified in us, whether by life or by death. 3. Double aspect of all Divine visitations of judgment, as confirming at once the strength of the Law and the faithfulness of the covenant, therefore both warning and encouragement. "Aaron held his peace," for he could only acknowledge the righteousness of God. Grace is above nature, and controls and exalts it.

III. A GREAT LESSON on the infirmity of man and the necessity of redemption. Immediately that the temple service was inaugurated, man spoiled it, as it were, by his sin. Compare the inauguration of earthly life spoiled by the sin of Adam and Eve; the new world after the Flood by Noah's sin (Gen. ix.); defection in the new land of Canaan (Judg. ii. 13); Solomon (1 Kings xi.); the corruption of the early Church (Acts xx. 29, etc.); the final apostacy (Rev. xx. 7-10). On what can we depend but the preserving mercy, the rescuing grace of him who has redeemed us? The "strange fire" was thus solemnly condemned only for the sake of calling out faith and attaching the people of God the more firmly to that fire of his love which, while it consumed the sacrifice on the cross, did also prepare the way for all into the holiest, that all might be kings and priests unto God through Christ.—R.

#### EXPOSITION.

THE COMMAND TO ABSTAIN FROM WINE (vers. 8-11). The law given to Aaron (some manuscripts read Moses) against the use of wine by the priests during their ministrations, by its juxtaposition with what has gone before, has led to the probable supposition that Nadab and Abihu had acted under the excitement of intoxicating drink. It is possible that the sacrificial meals on the peace offerings had begun, and that at the same time that the congregation was feasting, the two priests had refreshed themselves with wine after their long service. The special ceremonial meal of the priests had not yet been eaten.

Ver. 10.—Wine and other intoxicating liquors (*οἶνος*, whence the Greek word *οἰκεῖα*, Luke i. 18, was made from dates, or barley, or honey) are forbidden to the priests during their ministrations, that they may put a difference between holy and unholy; that is, that their minds may not be confused, but be capable of distinguishing between right and wrong, what ought and what ought not to be done. Nadab and Abihu, on the contrary, had not distinguished between the sacred and profane fire, or between God's commands and their own unregulated impulses. If they had partaken too freely of the wine provided for the drink offerings, their sin would be similar to that of the Corinthians in their abuse of the Lord's Supper. As to the use of wine by the

minister of God under the New Testament, see 1 Tim. iii. 2, 8; v. 23. The spiritual emotion, which, in the service of God, shows itself in pouring out the feelings in "psalms and hymns and spiritual songs," is contrasted, in Eph. v. 18, 19, with the physical excitement caused by wine, the former being commanded and the latter forbidden.

Ver. 11.—*That ye may teach the children of Israel.* This shows that one part of the priest's office was teaching the Law (cf. Deut. xxiv. 8; Mal. ii. 7).

Vers. 12—20.—Moses takes care that the remaining part of the ritual of the day shall be carried out in spite of the terrible interruption that has occurred. Under his instructions, Aaron and Eleazar and Ithamar eat the remainder of the meat offering (ch. ix. 17), in the court of the tabernacle, and reserve the wave breast and heave shoulder to eat in a clean place, that is, not necessarily within the court; but he finds that the sin offerings (ch. ix. 15), which ought to be eaten by the priests, had been burnt. The rule was that, when the blood was presented in the tabernacle, the flesh was burned; when it was not, the flesh was eaten by the priests. In the present case, the blood had not been brought within the holy place, and yet the flesh had been burned instead of being eaten. Moses was angry with Eleazar and Ithamar, and demanded an explanation. Aaron's plea of defence was twofold. 1. His sons had fulfilled aright the ritual of their own sin offering and burnt offering, that is, the offerings made for the priests, and it had been rather his duty than theirs to see that the ritual of the sin offering of the congregation had been properly carried out. 2. The state of distress in which he was, and the near escape that he had had from ceremonial defilement, and the sense of sin brought home to him by his children's death, had made him unfit and unable to eat the sin offering of the people, as he should have done under other circumstances. With this plea Moses was content. It was true that the letter of the Law had been broken, but there was a sufficient cause for it (see Hos. vi. 6; Matt. xii. 7). It appears from hence that the expiation wrought by the sin offering was not complete until the whole ceremony was accomplished, the last act of which was the eating of the flesh by the priests in one class of sin offering, and the burning the flesh outside the camp in the other. It has been questioned, what is the full meaning of the expression, God hath given it you—the flesh of the sin offering—to bear the iniquity of the congregation, to make atonement for them before the Lord. Archdeacon Freeman expresses the view of A. Lapide, Keil, and

many others when he says that, by eating the flesh of the offering, the priests "in a deep mystery neutralized, through the holiness vested in them by their consecration, the sin which the offerer had laid upon the victim and upon them" ('Principles of Divine Service,' pt. ii.). Oehler, on the other hand (Herzog's 'Cyclop.' x.), maintains that the priests did no more by this act than *declare* the removal of the sin already taken away; with which accords Philo's explanation ('De Viot.' 13, quoted by Edersheim, 'Temple Service,' ch. vi.) that the object of the sacrificial meal was to carry assurance of acceptance to the offerer, "since God would never have allowed his servants to partake of it had there not been a complete removal and forgetting of the sin atoned for." Neither of these explanations seems to be altogether satisfactory. The former attributes more meaning to the expression *bear the iniquity* than it appears to have elsewhere; e.g. Exod. xxviii. 38 and Numb. xviii. 1, where Aaron is said to *bear the iniquity of the holy things and of the sanctuary*; and Ezek. iv. 4—6, where the prophet is said to *bear the iniquity* of Israel and Judah. The latter interpretation appears too much to evacuate the meaning of the words. It is quite certain that the part of the ceremony by which the atonement was wrought (if it was wrought by any one part) was the offering of the blood for the covering of the offerer's sins, but yet this action of the priests in eating the flesh of the victim was in some way also connected with the atonement, not only with the assurance of its having been wrought; but in what way this was effected we are not told, and cannot pronounce. The words *bear the iniquity* are equivalent to making atonement for by taking the sin in some sense upon themselves (cf. Isa. liii. 11, "He shall bear their iniquities," and John i. 29, "Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away [or beareth] the sin of the world"). Accordingly, Bishop Patrick comments: "The very eating of the people's sin offering argued the sins of the people were, in some sort, laid upon the priests, to be taken away by them. From whence the sacrifice of Christ may be explained, who is said to *bear our iniquity* (as the priest is here said to do), all our sins being laid on him, who took upon him to make an expiation for them by the sacrifice of himself. For the priest, hereby eating of the sin offering, receiving the guilt upon himself, may well be thought to prefigure One who should be both Priest and Sacrifice for sin; which was accomplished in Christ" (on Lev. x. 17).

## HOMILETICS.

Ver. 11.—*That priests are teachers* is assumed all through the Old Testament. The contrast in this respect which has been found by some between the prophets and the priests, the former being the spiritual guides of the people, and the latter the organs of a dull ceremonial routine or even rude slayers of beasts, has no foundation in fact. It is true that the primary work of the priest was to teach by type and rite, and the primary work of the prophet to declare God's will by word of mouth; but they were co-ordinate, not hostile, influences and powers, having the same end in view, which they carried out, partly by the same, partly by different means. If the prophet sharply reprobates the priests, it is because they are bad priests, not because they are priests (Mal. ii. 1); and when he strikes at the priest, he sometimes strikes at the prophet in the same breath (Jer. v. 30, 31).

**THE MINISTER OF THE GOSPEL IS THE SUCCESSOR AND REPRESENTATIVE OF BOTH PRIEST AND PROPHET.** He has to conduct the public worship of God, which must always be a solemn occupation, though now disengaged of the minute regulations of the Judaic Law, and he is a channel through whom the Divine blessing flows; in this he represents the priest. He is the expounder and preacher of God's Word; herein he represents the prophet. He teaches God's commandments and applies them to the consciences of individuals; herein he does the work of both priest and prophet. But he holds a higher office than either one or the other, inasmuch as he is the dispenser of the gifts of the Holy Ghost for the good of man, which were purchased for man by Christ's death, received by him of his Father at his ascension, and shed forth upon his Church in the form of graces dispensed by the apostolic ministry (see Eph. iv. 7-11).

## HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

Vers. 8-11.—*Abstinence enjoined.* Without asserting positively that inflammatory drink was the cause of the unhallowed presentation made by the sons of Aaron, we may believe that it was the wise and merciful intention of the prohibition herein contained to guard against a possible source of similar heedless attendance upon God in his sanctuary.

**I. THE FUNCTIONS OF THE PRIESTS.** 1. To observe the various rites connected with the worship of God. 2. To see that nothing unholy entered the precincts of the tabernacle. The incense, which might suffice without, would be an insult to Jehovah within. The fire, useful for common cooking purposes, would be counted "strange fire" if presented to the Lord. 3. To advise the people concerning the distinction made by the Law between things clean and unclean. There was the food permissible to be eaten, the diseases requiring separation, the times in which ceremonial uncleanness was contracted, etc. All these matters were under the supervision of the priests. 4. To instruct the people generally in the statutes of the Lord. In the absence of written documents, this was a very important part of the duties of the priests, and furnished one of the reasons for afterwards locating their cities amongst the different tribes of Israel. This teaching was the origin of the present exposition of Scripture by the preacher, being now the chief feature of the minister's office. Is the acquaintance of the people with the Bible at all commensurate with the many advantages they enjoy? The Israelites may rise up in the day of judgment to condemn the ignorance of modern civilization.

**II. THE IMPORTANCE OF BRIGHTLY DISCHARGING THESE FUNCTIONS.** Consider the happy results that would flow from a proper fulfilment of their obligations, and the dire effects of lax observance of the regulations of the priesthood. In this latter event God would be insulted and profaned, his indignation would destroy the slothful servants, and the nation of Israel would relapse into a state of idolatry and disgrace. No priest lived or died unto himself. The progress and comfort of others were inseparably bound up with his due attendance at the altar.

**III. THE NECESSITY OF ABSTAINING FROM WHATEVER IMPAIRS CLEARNESS OF**

**THOUGHT AND STEADINESS OF CONDUCT.** The effects of "wine" or "strong drink" are various in different men and at different stages. Carelessness, excitement, stupefaction,—either might ensue, and bring upon the offender the wrath of God. The principle is obvious that *the service of God may require abstinence from enjoyments otherwise permissible*. As the number of priests was at this time so limited, the injunction of the text practically enforced almost continuous abstinence upon them. Enthusiasm stimulated by unworthy means, boldness engendered by false heat, an inability to declare the whole counsel of God, imagination running riot among his precepts,—these are offensive to God in his servants, and expose the possessors to his judgments. To walk not in the path of danger is better than to calculate upon successfully encountering its risks. The householder who cuts off the supply of gas is in no fear of an explosion, nor needs continually to examine the pipes. This prudent method is to be commended where the light furnished is unsteady, or superfluous because of the shining of the purer light. Drink not at the ruddy stream, and you will not dread its poison.—S. R. A.

**Vers. 8—11.—Sobriety in the priesthood.** The Jews say that Nadab and Abihu were inebriated when they sinned in offering strange fire, and that this law, forbidding intoxicants to the priests while serving in the holy place, was given in consequence. It is remarkable that, whereas both before and after this God spake "by the hand of Moses," the instruction before us was given, immediately, "to Aaron." The reasons for the prohibition are—

I. **THAT MINISTERS SHOULD BE RECOLLECTED IN THE PRESENCE OF GOD.** 1. *He was present in the tabernacle.* (1) In the text, as in many places, it is distinguished as the "tabernacle of the congregation." The original (*מִזְבֵּחַ מִקְדָּשׁ, ohel moqhed*) might perhaps be better rendered, "tabernacle of meeting." This would not exclude the idea of the congregation or meeting of the people, while it recognizes another more important truth, viz. that the tabernacle was the place appointed for God to *meet* with his people (comp. Exod. xxv. 22; xxix. 42, 43; xxx. 6, 36). (2) Apart from this criticism, the fact is patent that the symbol of the Divine presence was there. Where the Shechinah is, the ground is holy; and it behoves the worshipper to put away irreverence, and, with clearness of intellect as well as fervour of holy zeal, to wait upon the Lord (see Exod. iii. 5; xix. 12; Josh. v. 15). (3) We should never forget that in our Christian assemblies God is no less certainly present (see Matt. xviii. 20; Luke xxiv. 36; Rev. i. 13). 2. *And God is jealous of his honour.* (1) This important truth is here intimated in the caution, "lest ye die." Confused by inebriation, some error might be committed which would involve fatal consequences (see context). (2) Now, since this enactment, to taste the cup whose effects may expose to the liability of committing such an error, is itself a crime to be visited with death. The spirit of this instruction is that we must not tempt Satan to tempt us; that we are only safe when at the utmost distance from sin. (3) Abstinence at other times was not obligatory upon the priests, but they might become Nazarites if they pleased. Gospel ministers should be sober men (1 Tim. iii. 3).

II. **THAT THEY NEED THEIR FACULTIES TO KEEP THEIR CHARGE.** 1. *They have to judge in holy things.* (1) In the service of the tabernacle some food was "most holy," and had to be eaten beside the altar (ver. 12). This must not be eaten by "females among the priests." Yet a son of Aaron who had such a blemish as would preclude his attendance at the altar may eat of it (ch. xxi. 22). In some cases "holy" meats might be eaten by the priests and their families, but not by ordinary Israelites (ver. 14); while in others the offerer had his share of the offering. (2) Holy things might be polluted by accident. Thus a defiled person touching them would profane them (ch. vii. 19); or the flesh of the peace offering eaten on the third day, even by a priest, is profaned, and the priest punishable (ch. vii. 18; xix. 7, 8). Unclean persons must not eat of the holy things on pain of excommunication (ch. vii. 20, 21). (3) For the carrying out of all these laws, together with those of the distinction between persons, animals, and things, clean and unclean, the priest needed a clear head, (a) that he might save his soul alive, (b) and that he might fittingly typify Christ, whose judgment in moral and spiritual causes is true. (4) Therefore he must abstain from wine and strong drinks (see Isa. xxviii. 7). And ministers of the gospel

must be sober. If not types, they are "ambassadors," of Christ. They need a sound judgment to pronounce clearly and firmly against the efforts of antichrist to profane the laver and the altar in the sanctuary. 2. *They have to teach the statutes of the Lord.* (1) The Law is the standard of appeal. It was spoken by the Lord from Sinai. It was "given by the hand of Moses," who authenticated it to be the Word of God by many miracles. The gospel is the "engrafted Word" (Jas. i. 21), "spoken to us by the Son of God, confirmed by them that heard him, and authenticated by signs and wonders and divers miracles and distributions of the Holy Ghost (Heb. i. 1, 2; ii. 3, 4). (2) The duty of teaching the laws of the Old Testament devolved upon the priests (Deut. xxiv. 8; Neh. viii. 2, 8; Jer. xviii. 18; Mal. ii. 7). Christian ministers now stand in a similar relation to the Church under the New Testament. (3) If sobriety was necessary in the teachers of the Law, it is surely no less necessary in those who teach the vital truths of the gospel (2 Tim. ii. 15; Titus i. 7-9). Ministers of the New Testament may become Nazarites if they please; they should at least be Nazarites when "holding forth the Word of life."—J. A. M.

Vers. 12-15.—*The eating of the holy things.* In the words of the last paragraph God speaks immediately to Aaron; here Moses resumes, addressing now "Aaron and his sons *that were left*," or who had escaped the terrible judgment in which Nadab and Abihu were involved. He repeats his instructions concerning—

I. THE MEAT OFFERING REMAINING OF THE OFFERINGS MADE BY FIRE. 1. *This was accounted "most holy."* (1) This is equivalent to calling it the "bread of God" (comp. xxi. 6, 22). It was therefore "most holy," as typifying Christ (John vi. 33). He is "most holy" in the mystery of his birth, as "coming down from heaven" (Luke i. 35). Also in his death, by which he was able to "give his life unto the world." (2) It was the priests' due, or appointment, viz. from God. For it was first given to God, and now came from him. So Jesus, whom we bring to God as the Atoning Sacrifice for our sin, God gives to us for the nourishment of our souls. To the spiritual priesthood he is still the "Bread of God that cometh down from heaven." 2. *It was to be eaten, viz.* (1) "Beside the altar." Jesus becomes the food of his people *after his passion*. The bread of the Eucharist was "broken" before it was "given" to the disciples to eat (Matt. xxvi. 28; John xii. 24; 1 Cor. xi. 23-26). The Lord's table is furnished from the altar that was without the camp (Heb. xiii. 10-12). (2) It was to be eaten "without leaven." There was neither "malice" nor "wickedness" in Jesus, nor should there be in those who seek his fellowship (1 Cor. v. 6-8). He is the Truth—Truth itself—Truth essential; fellowship with him, therefore, must be in "sincerity and truth." (3) It was to be eaten "in the holy place." The joys of the Christian profession should be sought in the fellowship of the saints. Odd persons, who stand aloof from Church communion, are not serving God according to his order.

II. THE WAVE BREAST AND HEAVE SHOULDER. 1. *These were accounted "holy."* (1) They were so because they had been offered to God. Julius Bate construes the words rendered "wave breast and heave shoulder" (ver. 14), "the breast that is *presented*, and the shoulder that is *lifted up*." This at least expresses the spirit of the original. (2) The "holy" as well as "most holy" bread is the same as the bread of God (see ch. xxi. 22), and equally points to Christ. Both were alike the priests' due or appointment (Exod. xxix. 24). 2. *The holy things were to be eaten in a clean place.* (1) This marks the difference between the "holy" and the "most holy." The "most holy" must be eaten in the holy place, in the court of the priests, and therefore by the priests alone, but the "holy" may be eaten in the houses, and therefore by the daughters of the priests. (2) The moral teaching is that while the "most holy" communion with Christ is by the altar-side in his Church, we may have "holy" communion with him in our families. The ordinary meals of godly persons will be received as from God with thanksgiving, and thereby become in a sense sacramental (see 1 Cor. x. 18-31). (3) The one limitation is that the holy things of the peace offerings must be eaten "in a clean place." Viewed in the letter, this means that the house must not be polluted by the dead, or by a leper, or anything for which the purifications of the Law may be required. Viewed in the spirit, the teaching is that if we would have communion with Christ in our families, vicious dispositions and ungodly strangers must be excluded. "The friendship of the world is enmity against God" (see 2 Cor. vi. 14-18; Jas. iv. 4; 1 John ii. 15).—J. A. M.

Vers. 16-20.—*Moses and Aaron an allegory.* Moses may be taken as the impersonation of the Law which was given by his hand (see Luke xvi. 29; Acts xv. 21). Hence the “body of Moses,” about which Michael disputed with Satan, is by some supposed to denote the substance of the Law (Jude 9). In this view he appeared upon the mount of transfiguration, surrendering to Christ, who, in like manner, impersonated his gospel (Matt. xvii. 3-5). So the veil over Moses’ face represented the shadows in which the Law invested the glory of the Lord until the death of Christ, when the darkness passed away and the true light shined forth. Hence, when the veil, that is to say, the flesh of Christ, was torn in death, the veil of the temple was rent from the top throughout (Matt. xxvii. 50, 51; 2 Cor. iii. 7; Heb. ix. 3, 8; x. 19, 20). Aaron’s function was to bring out the spiritual meaning of the Law; and so he was a type of Christ, who came not to destroy but to fulfil it. Bearing these things in mind, light may be let in upon the remarkable passage before us. We have here—

I. **THE ANGER OF MOSES.** 1. *Look at the history in the letter.* (1) Moses had given instructions to Aaron and his sons respecting the goat which was to be offered for the sin of the people (see ch. ix. 15, 16). (2) These instructions were not fully carried out. The goat was killed and its fat burnt upon the altar; but the flesh was not eaten in the holy place. (3) Moses made search, and behold the goat was burnt, probably without the camp (ch. iv. 12; vi. 11). This angered him, and led him to question the “sons of Aaron who were left,” or had escaped the fire that consumed their brethren, as to why they had deviated from his directions. 2. *Now look at the moral.* (1) It should have been eaten in the holy place, because it was “most holy,” that is to say, the “bread of God” (ch. vi. 16, 17; xxi. 22); that which wrath was to feed upon. This significantly pointed to Christ. After declaring himself to be the “bread of God which cometh down from heaven,” he explains, “the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world” (John vi. 51). How remarkably the mysteries of the bread offering and the “flesh” of the sin offering, associated on the Levitical altar, are again associated in this gospel explanation! (2) By the fire of God feeding upon the sin offering, it bore “the iniquity of the congregation, to make atonement for them before the Lord” (ver. 17). But this is said of the eating of the flesh by Aaron and his sons. By eating the flesh of the sin offering, then, Aaron was to appear as in the place of it (comp. 1 Cor. x. 7). This significantly indicated that the true sin offering was not to be an animal, but a *man*. (3) The rule is laid down that if the blood was not brought in within the holy place, the flesh should be eaten in the holy place (ver. 18). That rule showed that the Law priests were typically to bear the iniquity of the people, until that High Priest should come who would carry his own blood into the holy place not made with hands. In that event their functions were destined to cease.

II. **THE EXPLANATION OF AARON.** 1. *The anger of Moses was with the sons of Aaron.* (1) We are not told that he felt any anger towards Aaron. We see a propriety in this when we consider that Aaron was a type of Christ. Moses directed Aaron all through the ceremonials of his consecration, and so Christ in this world, in which he was consecrated to his priesthood, was “made under the Law.” But the Law could have no anger against Christ, “who fulfilled all its righteousness,” and in every way “magnified and made it honourable.” (2) But against the sons of Jesus, who are far from being as perfect as their Head, the Law may have occasion for anger. 2. *But Aaron speaks in his own person for his sons.* (1) (See ver. 19.) So Jesus takes the faults of his children upon himself (see Matt. viii. 16, 17; 1 Pet. ii. 24). (2) And speaking for them thus, Aaron was able to appease Moses. Not only was Moses “satisfied,” as in the text, but what Aaron urged was “well pleasing in his eyes,” as in the Hebrew. So triumphantly is Jesus able to deliver us from the anger of the Law (Rom. v. 9, 20, 21). 3. *But what is the import of Aaron’s words* (ver. 19)? (1) Here he concedes that the sin offering had been offered, and that, under usual conditions, to have complied with all the directions of Moses would have been proper. But he explains, “such things have befallen me,” referring to his parental sorrow in the loss of his sons under most distressing circumstances. He was, therefore, a mourner, not outwardly (see vers. 4-7), but in spirit, so, had he eaten the sin offering, would it have been accepted by the Lord, viz. who *looketh upon the heart*? Moses had nothing to reply to this (comp. Deut. xii. 7; 1 Sam. i. 7, 8; Hos. ix. 4). (2) But

was there not a prophetic meaning in these words of Aaron? As Caiaphas “spake not of himself, but being high priest that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation” (John x. 50, 51), does not Aaron as truly in the spirit of prophecy here say that the death of the priest sets aside the type (see Col. ii. 14)? (3) The consent of Moses shows how the Law bears testimony to Christ, and is itself to vanish as a shadow when the substance takes its place. (4) It also shows that it is proper to break the Law in the letter, when to do so is necessary to its observance in the spirit. The spirit of the Law is the gospel.—J. A. M.

Vers. 8—10.—*Wine and worship.* The prohibition of the text only extends to the priest about to officiate in the worship of God; “when ye go into the tabernacle.” It had no reference to the domestic use of wine; nor did it separate “strong wine” from sacred service altogether (Exod. xxix. 42; Numb. xxviii. 7). Perhaps, as some think, it was consequent upon the foregoing scene. But if not so closely connected with it as to be occasioned by it, the fact that its announcement followed that scene in order of time suggests the truth—

I. **THAT FROM THE WORSHIP OF GOD EVERY TEMPTATION SHOULD BE RELIGIOUSLY EXCLUDED.** If intoxicants would have even the slightest effect on the understanding so that error might be committed, they should be scrupulously avoided: and so with any and every source of peril, whatever it may be. Whatsoever would lead the mind away from God and his truth; whatsoever would interfere with the purity, sincerity, spirituality of public worship, should be shunned. It may be beautiful attire, ornamentation, music, rhetoric, philosophizing, etc. Every man must judge for himself; “happy is he who condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth” (Rom. xiv. 22).

II. **THAT IN THE WORSHIP OF GOD EVERY FACULTY SHOULD BE IN FULLEST EXERCISE.** If intoxicants are anywise injurious, they enfeeble, they make the body drowsy, the intellect clouded, the spirit heavy and unaspiring. To the worship of God we should bring our best; not by any means the lame and the blind, etc. (Mal. i. 8), nor the second best, but the very best we can bring—the flower in the bud, the fruit adorned with its bloom; not the wearied bodily frame that sinks to sleep while God is being approached; not the mind that has lost its elasticity and strength, but our most vigilant and wakeful, our most vigorous and energetic self. We should bring to his altar the power that can discern between the evil and the good, between the acceptable and the offensive (ver. 10); and the power that can rise on fleetest and most enduring wing into the heavens of joyful praise and earnest prayer and saving truth.

III. **THAT FOR THE WORSHIP OF GOD THERE SHOULD BE CAREFUL PREPARATION.** The priests were, in virtue of this and other precepts, to consider carefully beforehand what they should do and what they should avoid, that they might be ready to minister unto the Lord. Whether our offering of spiritual sacrifices unto God in his sanctuary (1 Pet. ii. 5) be acceptable or not, depends not more on the provision which is prepared *in* the house for us than on the conscientious preparing of our heart before we go up *unto* it.—C.

Ver. 11.—*Instruction as well as sacrifice.* These words point to—

I. **A SECONDARY DUTY OF THE PRIESTHOOD—INSTRUCTION.** No doubt the primary object of their appointment was sacrifice. Their function was, first of all, to mediate between God and the people, to stand at his altar and present sacrifices unto him. But this did not constitute their whole duty; they were to “teach the children of Israel all the statutes which the Lord had spoken.” No doubt the whole tribe of Levi was associated with the priesthood in “teaching Jacob the judgments and Israel the Law” of the Lord (see Deut. xxxiii. 8—11; Mal. ii. 7; Hos. iv. 6).

II. **THE TWOFOLD TASK THIS INSTRUCTION INVOLVED.** The priests and Levites would have: 1. To make known the particular precepts of the Law, so that the people might bring their proper sacrifices, come at the appointed seasons to the sacred festivals, shun all those things which were prohibited, act rightly in their various domestic and social relations, etc. 2. To explain the spirit and significance of the ritual, so that when the worshippers came to the tabernacle they might not only go through the right forms, but also enter into the spirit of them; so that they should be affected by

a sense of sin, by a hope of forgiveness, by a desire to dedicate themselves unto God, by a spirit of holy joy in God and of brotherly love toward their fellows. To communicate all the particulars of the Law, and leave uninterpreted their spiritual significance, would have been to omit an essential part of their sacred duty as religious instructors of the nation. We may be reminded of—

**III. THE OBLIGATIONS OF THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.** The privilege of those who minister for Christ is also twofold: 1. To lead souls with them to God; to suggest those thoughts and words through which the worshippers may address themselves to him and make their own personal, direct appeal to him. 2. To instruct in Christian truth. And this instruction is to combine two things: it is (1) to make known the will of God as stated in the sacred Scriptures; (2) to impress that will on the conscience of the congregation. The Christian minister seeks to *enlighten* and to *enforce*. Then he must leave those whom he serves, to act; they must then “bear their own burden.” Thus we come to—

**IV. THE DUTY OF THE CHRISTIAN CONGREGATION.** That is, to avail themselves of the work of the minister. 1. To follow him spiritually and sympathetically to the throne of grace and, with him, draw nigh to God in prayer. 2. To seek to understand the mind of God as it is stated and explained. 3. To apply to themselves and their own need the exhortations which are given.—C.

**Vera. 12-20.—*The spirit of obedience.*** The words of Moses appear to have followed closely upon the incidents described in the opening verses of the chapter. Thus viewed, they show—

**I. THAT THE SIN OF SOME MUST NOT INTERFERE WITH THE SERVICE OF OTHERS.** (Ver. 12.) Consternation or resentment might have led Aaron and “his sons that were left” to leave the remainder of their sacred duties undischarged. This must not be. The sin of the two sons must not interrupt the service of the Most High. His worship must not cease because two men have erred. Men often plead the inconsistencies and transgressions of others as an excuse for their own shortcoming. They decline to worship God, or to sit down to the table of the Lord, or to work in the vineyard of the Great Husbandman because of their resentment against the wrong-doing of their fellows. This may satisfy themselves, but it will have no weight at all in the balances of the Divine Judge.

**II. THAT THE SIN OF SOME NEED NOT INTERFERE WITH THE PRIVILEGE OF OTHERS.** (Ver. 14.) The whole congregation were to “bewail the burning which the Lord had kindled” (ver. 6). But they were, nevertheless, to “eat in a clean place of the sacrifices of peace offerings.” The saddest things need not interpose to prevent our enjoyment of the sacred privileges with which God has provided us.

**III. THAT RESPONSIBLE MEN MAY WELL BE VIGILANT IN ALL MATTERS PERTAINING TO THE SERVICE OF GOD.** (Vers. 16-18.) Moses “diligently sought” the goat which should not have been burnt, but eaten. He showed a holy solicitude to conform to the exact requirements of “the Law of the Lord,” and a commendable concern when he thought he discovered a slight departure therefrom. In Christ Jesus we are not bound by any minute commandments like those which regulated the temple service of the Jews. But there is room enough in the Church of Christ for holy vigilance on the part of those who are “over others in the Lord.” They should watch keenly to observe and to correct the slightest departure from the spirit of the Master; from the spirit (1) of reverence, or (2) of earnestness, or (3) of humility, or (4) of charity.

**IV. THAT THE SPIRIT OF OBEDIENCE IS EVERYTHING IN THE SIGHT OF GOD.** There is something profoundly touching in the excuse (ver. 19) which Aaron urged. His sons who “were left” had, spite of their bereavement and their fraternal sorrow, “offered their sin offering and their burnt offering before the Lord;” they had laid great restraint upon their feelings; they had striven to render the service required of them. And when “such things had befallen him;” when Aaron “held his peace,” indeed, but “his sorrow was stirred;” when his parental heart was bleeding,—would the eating of the flesh of the goat in such a “day of desperate grief” have been an acceptable service in the sight of the Lord? Would an act in which there must have been so large a measure of constraint have been in accordance with the will of God? Moses was content with Aaron’s plea; he felt that it was sound. We may infer that he was right in accepting it. Had

Aaron repined, or had he resented the retributive act of God, he would certainly have sinned. But this he did not. He summoned himself and his sons to continue in the service of the Lord, and only stopped at the point where overcoming sorrow laid its arresting hand upon him. God desires of us (1) the will to serve him, (2) the faith in him which uncomplainingly accepts his decisions when these are painful and perplexing, and (3) the endeavour, to the height of our power, to continue at our post. When the spirit of obedience is thus in our hearts, he does not exact a strict measure of work to be accomplished by our hands.—O.

Ver. 12.—*That which is left to us.* “His sons that were left.” Happily and mercifully, it is not often that we suffer such a breach in our life or in our home as that which Aaron was called upon this day to endure; but inroads are made, suddenly or gradually, upon our sources of joy. Accident (as we call it), disease, treachery, misfortune, the hand of time,—these take away our treasures; they strip the goodly tree of its branches, as well as of its leaves. But “though much is taken, much abides.” The good man has always consolation in that which is left to him. There is left to us—

I. **SOME HUMAN AFFECTION.** If not “sons that are left,” or daughters, yet friends whose attachment has grown with the growing years.

II. **SOME HUMAN ESTEEM.** There are those—it may be many, at any rate a few—who hold us in genuine regard; who honour us, and pour on our wounded spirit the precious ointment of their esteem.

III. Solacing memories of faithful work.

IV. The consciousness of our own integrity (Ps. xli. 12).

V. The abiding favour and friendship of the Lord (Ps. cxv. 2).

VI. The hope of eternal life in the presence of God (2 Tim. iv. 6).—O.

Vers. 8—20.—The ministers of God’s house must be examples of purity and obedience.

I. The influence of **PERSONAL CHARACTER** on the work of the teacher, “that ye may teach the children of Israel all the statutes,” etc. (ver. 11). 1. Self-control and temperance necessary to a wise judgment and a correct life. Possibly the offence of Nadab and Abihu owing to intemperance. 2. The teacher needs the respect of the taught to uphold him in his work. 3. The difference between the holy and the unholy, the clean and the unclean, should be *seen* as well as *heard* described.

II. **THE SUPPORT OF THE MINISTRY** may be safely left to come out of the faithful discharge of duty. If the priests are at their post, they will get their portion (vers. 12—15). “It shall be thine by a statute for ever.”

III. **THE ERRORS AND OMISSIONS**, as well as sins of the ministry, should be “diligently sought after.” But in the spirit of charity, not with harsh and censorious judgment. Aaron’s excuse was the overwhelming stress of natural feeling. Ministers are but men. Domestic affliction often clouds their mind and burdens their spirit. Moses was content when he understood that the law of nature was honoured; and there is no true sanctity in observances which violate the first principles of humanity, and subvert the natural feelings of the human heart. The slavish system of Rome exalts religious law at the expense of natural justice, and destroys man while it professes to save him. No true religion is cruel. The Spirit of Christ is the spirit of mercy.—R.

## PART III.

UNCLEANNESS, CEREMONIAL AND MORAL: ITS REMOVAL  
OR ITS PUNISHMENT.

## SECTION I.

## EXPOSITION.

## CHAPTER XI.

THE two preceding parts having made manifest the way of approach to God by means of sacrifice and the appointed priesthood of mediation, there follows part having for its subject that which keeps man apart from God, namely, uncleanness, whether ceremonial uncleanness, which may be removed by ceremonial observances, or moral uncleanness, that is, unrighteousness, which, so far as it is a ceremonial offence, may be also dealt with ceremonially, but in respect to its moral character demands punishment. This part consists of four sections. The first section, comprising chs. xi.—xv., treats of ceremonial uncleanness, caused (1) by unclean food (ch. xi.); (2) by childbirth (ch. xii.); (3) by the leprosy of man and of garments and of houses (chs. xiii., xiv.); (4) by issues (ch. xv.). The second section deals with the uncleanness contracted every year by the whole congregation, to be annually atoned for on the great Day of Atonement (ch. xvi.), followed by a parenthetical chapter as to the place in which sacrifice is to be offered—sacrifice being the means by which purification from uncleanness is to be effected (ch. xvii.). The third section is on moral uncleanness, or sin (chs. xviii., xix.), and its punishment (ch. xx.). The fourth relates to the ceremonial and moral uncleanness of priests (chs. xxi., xxii.).

The idea underlying ceremonial uncleanness is not peculiar to the Jews. With the Greeks the idea of moral beauty was borrowed from physical beauty, and the standard of moral excellence was the beautiful. With the Hebrews physical ugliness is taken as

the symbol of moral ugliness or deformity: whatever is foul is the type of what is evil. That which we have a natural admiration for is good, said the Greek; that which we have a natural repugnance for represents to us what is evil, said the Hebrew. In either case, taste appears to take the place of moral judgment; but in Greek philosophy, moral taste and moral judgment had come to be identical, while the Hebrew knew that what taste condemned was not therefore of itself evil, but only symbolical and representative of evil.

Another principle underlies the Hebrew theory of uncleanness. It is that whatever is itself foul, and therefore symbolical of sin, conveys the quality of foulness, and therefore of ceremonial uncleanness to any one it comes in contact with, and often to anything which it touches. Thus a dead body, quickly assuming a loathsome appearance in the East, where the setting in of corruption is very rapid, is unclean itself, and conveys uncleanness to those who touch it. The leper is unclean, and transmits uncleanness by his touch; and certain foul diseases and fluxes from the human body have the same effect. These and such like things, being always repulsive, always cause uncleanness; but there are others which, while in some associations they are utterly repellent, in others are not so. For example, there are some vermin and insects which are pretty to the eye, but the thought of eating them creates a natural feeling of disgust. These, in so far as they are not repulsive, that is, as creeping or flying creatures, are not unclean, nor does their touch produce uncleanness, but as objects of food they are "an abomination."

Hence we are able to explain the distinction of clean and unclean animals. It does not rest upon a sanitary basis, though the prohibition to eat carnivorous and other animals repulsive to the taste is probably in accordance with the rules of health. Nor is it based on political reasons, though it is probable that the distinction kept the Jews apart from other nations, and so served an important political purpose. Nor is the injunction in the main theological, though we know that in later times the favourite interpretation was that the clean animals represented the Jews, and the unclean animals the Gentiles (Acts x. 28). Rather it was that certain creatures were forbidden because they were offensive to the taste, and, being so offensive, they were symbolical of vicious things, which must be avoided, lest they make those that partake of them or touch them to become vicious like themselves.

Vers. 2—8 contain the regulations relating to the eating of quadrupeds; vera. 9—12, those relating to fish; vers. 13—19, those relating to birds; vers. 20—23, those relating to flying insects; vers. 29, 30, those relating to unwinged creeping things; vera. 41—44, those relating to vermin. Vers. 23—28 and 31—40 extend the defiling effect to the simple touch of the dead carcases of animals, whether edible or not.

Ver. 1.—The Lord spake unto Moses and to Aaron. Aaron, having now been consecrated high priest, is joined with Moses as the recipient of the laws on cleanness and uncleanness in ch. xi. 1; xiii. 1; xiv. 33; xv. 1. His name is not mentioned in ch. xii. 1; xiv. 1; xvii. 1; xviii. 1; xix. 1; xx. 1; xxi. 1, 16; xxii. 1, 17, 26. Probably there is no significance in these omissions.

Ver. 2.—These are the beasts that ye shall eat. In order that the Israelites might know how to avoid the uncleanness arising from the consumption of unclean flesh, plain rules are given them by which they may distinguish what flesh is clean and what is unclean. The first rule is that anything that dies of itself is unclean, whether it be beast, bird, or fish. The reasons of this are plain: for (1) the flesh still retains the blood, which no Israelite might eat; and (2) there is something loathsome in the idea of eating such flesh. Next, as to beasts, a class is marked off as edible by two plainly discernible characteristics, and instances are given to show that where there is any doubt owing to the animals possessing one

of the characteristic marks only, the rule is to be construed strictly. As to fish and insects, equally plain rules, one in each case, are laid down; but as birds are not readily distinguished into large classes, the names of those that are unclean are given one by one, the remainder being all of them permissible. Thus the simple Israelite would run no risk of incurring uncleanness by inadvertently eating unclean food, whether of beast, bird, fish, or insect. The object of the regulations being to exclude all meats naturally offensive to the human taste, all carnivorous quadrupeds are shut out by the rule of chewing the cud (ver. 3), with the same purpose, birds of prey and birds that eat offal are prohibited (vera. 13—19), and scaleless fish on account of their repulsive appearance (vera. 9—12), as well as beetles, maggots, and vermin of all sorts. In the case of beasts and fish, the rules laid down to mark off those things that are offensive, being general in their application, are such as to include in the forbidden class some few which do not appear naturally loathsome. This is owing partly to the difficulty of classification, partly to a change of feeling which experience has wrought in the sentiments of mankind with regard to such edibles as swine's flesh and shell-fish.

Vera. 3, 4.—Whatsoever parteth the hoof, and is clovenfooted, should rather be translated, *Whatsoever parteth the hoof, and completely divides it.* The camel parts but does not wholly divide the hoof, as there is a ball at the back of the foot, of the nature of a heel.

Ver. 5.—The coney, Hebrew, *shaphan*; the *Hyrax Syriacus*, or *wabir*, still called in Southern Arabia *tsufun*, a little animal similar to but not identical with the rabbit. "They live in the natural caves and clefts of the rocks (Ps. civ. 18), are very gregarious, being often seen seated in troops before the openings of their caves, and extremely timid, as they are quite defenceless (Prov. xxx. 26). They are about the size of rabbits, of a brownish-grey or brownish-yellow colour, but white under the belly; they have bright eyes, round ears, and no tail. The Arabes eat them, but do not place them before their guests" (Keil).

Ver. 6.—The hare, because he cheweth the cud, but divideth not the hoof. There is little doubt that the same animal as our hare is meant. Neither the hare, however, nor the hyrax chews the cud in the strict sense of the words. But they have the appearance of doing so. The rule respecting chewing the cud was given to and by Moses as a legislator, not as an anatomist, to serve as a sign by which animals might be known to be clean for food. Phenomenal

not scientific language is used here, as in Josh. x. 12, "as we might speak of whales and their congeners as fish, when there is no need of scientific accuracy" (Clark). "All these marks of distinction in the Levitical law are wisely and even necessarily made on the basis of popular observation and belief, not on that of anatomical exactness. Otherwise the people would have been continually liable to error. Scientifically, the camel would be said to divide the hoof, and the hare does not chew the cud. But laws for popular use must necessarily employ terms as they are popularly understood. These matters are often referred to as scientific errors; whereas they were simply descriptions, necessarily popular, for the understanding and enforcement of the law" (Gardiner).

Ver. 7.—The swine, though he divide the hoof, and be clovenfooted. Here, again, the description is not according to anatomical analysis, but to ordinary appearance. The pig appears to be cloven-footed, and it would be misleading to give any other account of his foot in ordinary speech, but scientifically speaking, he has four toes. The prohibition of the use of swine's flesh does not arise from the fear of trichinosis or other disease, but from the disgust caused by the carnivorous and filthy habits of the Eastern pig. The repulsion originally felt for swine's flesh was natural, and, where the animal is carnivorous, is still natural, but where its habits are changed, and it has become simply graminivorous, the feeling has ceased to exist.

Ver. 8.—Of their carcase shall ye not touch. This prohibition is founded upon the same feeling of disgust as the prohibition of eating their flesh. Whatever is foul must be avoided.

Ver. 9—12.—Whatsoever hath fins and scales. The absence of fins and scales, or their apparent absence—for phenomenal language is used, as before—gives to fish a repulsive look, on which is grounded the prohibition to eat them. Eels and shell-fish are thus forbidden, though a long course of experience has now taken away the feeling of repulsion with which they were once looked upon. The flesh of the beasts forbidden to be eaten is only described as unclean, but that of the prohibited fish, birds, insects, and vermin, is designated as an abomination unto you.

Ver. 13—19.—The unclean birds are those which are gross feeders, devourers of flesh or offal, and therefore offensive to the taste, beginning with the eagle and vulture tribe. It is probable that the words translated owl (ver. 16), night hawk (ver. 16), eukaw (ver. 16) should be rendered, *ostrich*, *owl*, *gull*, and perhaps for swan (ver. 18), heron (ver.

19), *lapwing* (ver. 19), should be substituted *ibis*, *great plover*, *hoopoe*. In the case of the bat, we have again phenomenal language used. Being generally regarded as a bird, it is classed with birds.

Vers. 20—23.—All fowls that creep should rather be rendered *all winged creeping things*, that is, all flying insects. None are allowed except the *Saltatoria*, or locust family. The word translated beetle signifies a sort of locust, like the other three words. That the locust was a regular article of food in Palestine is amply proved. "It is well known that locusts were eaten by many of the nations of antiquity, both in Asia and Africa, and even the ancient Greek thought the cicadas very agreeable in flavour (Arist. 'Hist. An.', 5, 30). In Arabia they are sold in the market, sometimes strung upon cords, sometimes by measure, and they are also dried and kept in bags for winter use. . . . They are generally cooked over hot coals, or on a plate, or in an oven, or stewed in butter, and eaten either with salt or with spice and vinegar, the head, wings, and feet being thrown away. They are also boiled in salt and water, and eaten with salt or butter. Another process is to dry them thoroughly, and then grind them into meal, and make cakes of them" (Keil). (Cf. Matt. iii. 4.) The expression goeth upon all four, means grovelling or going in a horizontal position, in contrast with two-legged birds, just spoken of.

Vera. 24—28.—These verses contain an expansion of the warning contained in ver. 8, to the effect that the touch of the dead bodies of the forbidden animals was defiling, as well as the consumption of their flesh. A further mark of an unclean animal is added in ver. 27: *Whatsoever goeth upon his paws*; that is, whatever has not hoofs, but goes stealthily, like beasts of prey of the cat kind. It includes also dogs.

Vera. 29, 30.—The creeping things that creep upon the earth. This class contains things that go on their belly, but have not wings, like the previous class of creeping things (vers. 20—23). By the words translated tortoise, ferret, chameleon, lizard, snail, mole, different varieties of the lizard are probably meant. The mouse is joined by Isaiah with "eating swine's flesh and the abomination" (Isa. lxvi. 17).

Vera. 31—38.—As the little animals just mentioned—weasels, mice, and lizards—are more likely than those of a larger size to be found dead in domestic utensils and clothes, a further warning as to their defiling character is added, with rules for daily use. The words translated ranges for pots (ver. 35) should rather be rendered *covered pots*, that is, pots or kettles with lids to them. Seed which is to be sown, that is, seed corn, is not defiled by contact with these dead

animals, unless it has been wetted by water being put on it, in which case the moisture would convey the corruption into the seeds.

Vers. 39, 40.—The loathsomeness of the bodies of even clean animals that have died a natural death, makes them also the means of conveying defilement to any one who touches them.

Vers. 41-43.—The last class is that of vermin, which constitute a part of the un-winged creeping class already spoken of (vers. 29, 30). *Whatsoever goeth upon the belly* indicates snakes, worms, maggots; *whatsoever goeth upon all four*, things that grovel, as moles, rats, hedgehogs; *whatsoever hath more feet, or doth multiply feet*, centipedes, caterpillars, spiders.

Vers. 44-47.—These concluding verses give a religious sanction to the previous regulations, and make them matters of sacred, not merely sanitary or political, obligation. They were to *sanctify themselves*, that is,

to avoid uncleanness, because God is holy, and they were God's. They were thus taught that ceremonial cleanliness of the body was a symbol of holiness of heart, and a means of attaining to the latter. *For I am the Lord that bringeth you up out of the land of Egypt.* It is possible that Egypt may be named as being the land of animal-worship. *To be your God; ye shall therefore be holy, for I am holy.* The only way by which there can be communion between God and man is the way of holiness.

Jewish industry and care has counted the number of letters in the Pentateuch, and marked by the use of the letter *ו* in larger type, in the word *וְיְהִי*, which occurs in ver. 42, that that letter is the middle letter of the whole work, from the beginning of Genesis to the end of Deuteronomy. It is easy to see what a protection to the text such minute and scrupulous care must be.

### HOMILETICS.

#### *Meats distinguished into clean and unclean now for the first time.*

I. ORIGINALLY MAN'S LIBERTY WITH RESPECT TO EATING FLESH WAS UNRESTRICTED. Such is St. Paul's teaching: "Meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth. For every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving" (1 Tim. iv. 3, 4). "Unto the pure all things are pure" (Titus i. 15). "The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof" (1 Cor. x. 26). "I know, and am persuaded by the Lord Jesus, that there is nothing unclean of itself" (Rom. xiv. 14). And our Lord has taught, that "there is nothing from without a man, that entering into him can defile him" (Mark vii. 15).

II. THE RESTRAINTS NOW INTRODUCED WERE ONLY TEMPORARY. They were only intended to serve a purpose for a time, while the principle underlying them is of permanent application. So the sabbatical law is of permanent obligation, but the form which that law took in the Mosaic dispensation was temporary, and has been abrogated without injury to the binding force of the sabbatical law, that one seventh of our time should be given to God.

III. THE PURPOSE OF THESE RESTRAINTS. Their object was educational. They were intended to teach, in a manner that the Israelites were capable of apprehending, and that was consonant with the rest of the Mosaic legislation, an abhorrence of spiritual evil, by fostering an abhorrence of physical foulness which was taken as the representative of moral evil.

IV. THEIR LESSON WAS TAUGHT. When the time of the institution of the new dispensation had arrived, the distinction between good and evil had been taught by the difference between fair and foul, or if not taught, it could be now taught in a better way than by sensible types and figures. Teaching by word had taken the place of teaching by images.

V. THEIR INTENTION WAS PERVERTED. The more carnal minded among the Jews rested in the letter of the command, and added other material injunctions to it, "in the washing of cups, and pots, brasen vessels, and tables" (Mark vii. 4). With them the command had failed in its purpose, and they satisfied themselves with a mere external observance of the letter. This our Lord sharply reproved: "There is nothing from without a man, that entering into him can defile him: but the things which come out of him, those are they that defile the man. . . . Do ye not perceive, that whatsoever thing from without entereth into the man, it cannot defile him; because it entereth not

into his heart, but into the belly, and goeth out into the draught, purging all meats?<sup>1</sup> And he said, That which cometh out of the man, that defileth the man. For from within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness: all these evil things come from within, and defile the man" (Mark vii. 15—23). This teaching prepared the way for the abolition of the restriction.

**VI. RESTORATION OF THE ORIGINAL LIBERTY.** First taught by the vision of St. Peter. "Peter went up upon the housetop to pray about the sixth hour: and he became very hungry, and would have eaten: but while they made ready, he fell into a trance, and saw heaven opened, and a certain vessel descending unto him, as it had been a great sheet knit at the four corners, and let down to the earth: wherein were all manner of fourfooted beasts of the earth, and wild beasts, and creeping things, and fowls of the air. And there came a voice to him, Rise, Peter; kill, and eat. But Peter said, Not so, Lord; for I have never eaten anything that is common or unclean. And the voice spake unto him again the second time, What God hath cleansed, that call not thou common. This was done thrice: and the vessel was received up again into heaven" (Acts x. 9—16). The first purpose of this vision was to show the acceptance of the Gentiles, who, according to the now received Jewish interpretation, were represented by the unclean beasts; but that was not the only lesson taught; there was also involved the conception that the whole system of clean and unclean meats was abolished. This doctrine, as we have seen, was adopted and enforced by St. Paul, and he says that it is as a Christian that he has learnt this lesson, "I know, and am persuaded by (in) the Lord Jesus, that there is nothing unclean of itself. . . . All things indeed are pure" (Rom. xiv. 14—20). "Meat commendeth us not to God" (1 Cor. vii. 8). "For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost" (Rom. xiv. 17).

**VII. PROHIBITION OF BLOOD, AND THINGS STRANGLLED, CONTINUED BY THE COUNCIL OF JERUSALEM.** The Council of Jerusalem, in deciding the terms on which the Gentiles should be admitted to the Christian Church, forbade the eating of things offered to idols, and blood, and things strangled. The first of these restrictions rested on a different principle; the second and third are a continuation of the Mosaic regulations, and the reason why they are retained is given. "For Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogue every sabbath day" (Acts xv. 21). Inasmuch as the Christian Church consisted of Jews and Gentiles, and the former of these regarded themselves as bound by the Mosaic legislation, the Synod of Jerusalem desired that the Gentiles should concede to their brethren so far as not to partake of those things which Jewish Christians thought themselves bound to abstain from, lest there should be a schism between the two divisions of the Church. This law had become one of charity solely, and would naturally be abrogated, or rather cease to bind, when the occasion for it ceased. As in the parallel case of meats offered to idols, "no man" was to "put a stumbling-block or an occasion to fall in his brother's way" (Rom. xiv. 13). "It is good neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor anything whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak" (Rom. xiv. 21). "If meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend" (1 Cor. viii. 13). But no flesh was now forbidden by a positive regulation of God. The rule had become one of charity, and when the number of Jewish Christians ceased to be considerable in relation to Gentiles, it naturally came to an end.

Ver. 44.—"Ye shall be holy; for I am holy." This is the pervading principle of both dispensations.

I. **ORIGINALLY MAN WAS CREATED IN THE IMAGE OF GOD.** (Gen. i. 27.) St. Paul tells us that the likeness consisted "in righteousness and true holiness" (Eph. iv. 24). The likeness continued until man fell. After the Fall, God's image, though not obliterated, was no longer reflected in man, except in a blurred and perverted manner, as in a cracked mirror. Man ceased to be holy, and his communion with God was lost.

II. **THE DESIRED EFFECT OF REVEALED RELIGION IS TO RECOVER THE LOST IMAGE AND SO TO RESTORE COMMUNION BETWEEN GOD AND MAN.** Under the old dispensa-

<sup>1</sup> Or, "This he said, making all meats clean" (Revised Version).

tion, a legal and conventional holiness was brought about by means of the sacrifices and purifications. Man was replaced in a state of symbolical, though not real holiness, and so far and so long as that state was maintained by ceremonial rites and cleansing, the relation of communion with God was symbolically restored and preserved. In the new dispensation, that which was symbolized only before, became really effected in the case of those who, having been adopted in Christ, were sanctified by the operation of the Holy Spirit in their heart, and thus "put on the new man, which, after God, is created in righteousness and true holiness" (Eph. iv. 24).

III. HIGHER CONCEPTION OF HOLINESS UNDER THE GOSPEL THAN THE LAW. Under the Law, on the principle, "Ye shall be holy," is founded the command to abstain from ceremonial uncleanness or defilement; "Ye shall therefore sanctify yourselves, . . . neither shall ye defile yourselves with any manner of creeping thing that creepeth on the earth" (ch. xi. 44). In the New Testament, the same principle is invoked as the ground of avoiding moral, not physical, uncleanness, "For this is the will of God, even your sanctification, that ye should abstain from fornication . . . for God hath not called us unto uncleanness, but unto holiness" (1 Thess. iv. 3—7). And the very text before us is quoted for the purpose of urging upon the Christians no mere ritual purification, but the highest spirituality of life. "As he which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation; because it is written, Be ye holy; for I am holy" (1 Pet. i. 15, 16).

IV. PRACTICAL CONCLUSION. "Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God" (2 Cor. vii. 1). "What manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness?" (2 Pet. iii. 11). Carnal cleanliness is not sufficient; moral uprightness is not sufficient; our aim must be holiness, as God is holy, and as this holiness was manifested in Christ.

#### HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

*The religious use of nature.* Ch. xi.; cf. Ps. civ., cvii.; Job xxxviii.—xli.; Matt. xiii.; 2 Sam. xxii. 34. We pass now to the relation in which the Lord's people are to stand to animated nature. So far from treating it with indifference, they were bound to regard certain animals as clean and certain others as unclean, and to regard their use of and contact with them as of religious importance. The temptation to use nature as something outside religious considerations was hereby avoided, and the Jew was led to regard every animal as having some religious significance to him. A literal watchfulness was thus inculcated of the most painstaking character. The Jew, wherever he went, was on his guard against the unclean, and was providing for his use only what was legally clean and pure.

I. NATURE IS A REVELATION OF GOD IF WE ONLY HAD ITS KEY. It is too often forgotten that nature was the first revelation of God to his creatures. The Bible is the supplementary revelation necessitated by sin. To our first parents before the Fall, nature had a deeper meaning, most probably, than it has yet had to us. The interpretation of nature is most important, and there is no need that it should be "agnostic" or irreligious. Provided scientific fact be welcomed, there is no detriment, but rather there is gain, in looking at our surroundings in a religious spirit. Science is not bound to become a department of theology, and to be running up into theological statements; neither, on the other hand, is it bound to indulge in atheistic ones. The "argument of design" may not be a part of science, but it is just as true that the argument of chance, which is the only alternative, is no part of true science either. But while science is under no obligation to become theological, it is right that nature should be regarded religiously. Natural religion has its sphere just as well as supernatural religion.

II. WE INSTINCTIVELY USE ANIMATED NATURE TO ILLUSTRATE THE CHARACTERISTICS OF MANKIND. The animals become our picture alphabet, by whose help we spell out character. Indeed, so close are the affinities between the lower animals and the successive stages of human character, that one ingenious foreign writer points out an analogy between the development in nature and the development in individual human nature.

“ Man passes still to-day,” says M. Secretan,<sup>1</sup> “ through the form of the ape, and he passes through it visibly; the embryonic evolution continues itself in the transformations of the first age, the spiritual development allies itself to the corporeal evolution, it is regulated by the same laws. Just as the human body reproduces in summary form the whole history of organized nature, the spirit of a civilized person reproduces in abridgment the whole history of the human spirit, and the two histories are inseparable. The characteristic of the ape, imitation without intelligence, is also the characteristic of the child when he is put in possession of his organs. This phase is essential; the child would not learn to eat, he would not learn to walk, he would not learn especially to speak, and by consequence to think, were he not, during some period and in certain respects, a little parrot and a little ape. Simian imitation is the process by which the acquisitions of the species are appropriated by the individual. Simian imitation, by which I mean the reproduction of movements of which the intention is not comprehended, is the normal and desired transition between instinct and the reflective intelligence, which is the properly human condition.” There seems, therefore, to be a reason in the very nature of things for the illustration of moral or immoral qualities from the animals. Amid other uses served by the lower creation, there is certainly this one of furnishing illustrations of character. Our Lord’s parables embody the principle of the spiritual significance of nature in its broadest applications.

III. BY THE DIVISION OF THE ANIMALS HERE PROPOSED IMPORTANT MORAL QUALITIES ARE RECOMMENDED AND IMMORAL ONES CONDEMNED. A scientific division was not needed for a religious purpose. A popular division, easily apprehended, would serve infinitely better. The distinctions drawn are such as may be seen at a glance.

1. *Quadrupeds.* The clean are those who divide the hoof and chew the cud. In other words, the ruminants are to be regarded as the clean. All other quadrupeds are to be accounted unclean. That there may be no mistake, the camel, coney, hare, and swine are emphasized as unclean, because possessing only one of the required characteristics. The flesh of the ruminants is generally considered as more wholesome than that of the other quadrupeds; but this would scarcely determine the division. Let the fact, however, be noted that *reflection* finds its fitting illustration in the rumination of these animals, and that they are justly regarded as both *sure-footed* and *cleanly*; then we see a moral purpose in the distinction. If the Lord’s people were to associate with these animals and use them for food, while the other quadrupeds were to be avoided, it was to teach them to *reflect* faithfully upon what God gave them, to be *steadfast* in running the race he sets before them, and to be *pure* in their walk and conversation. That such moral ideas were associated with the clean animals is corroborated by such passages as 2 Sam. xxii. 34; Pa. xviii. 33; Hab. iii. 19; with which may be compared 1 Sam. ii. 9.

2. *Fishes.* Here, again, the clean ones are those which have both fins and scales. All that have not these two characteristics are to be deemed an abomination, such as sharks, eels, and the swimmers generally (vv.). That moral characteristics are illustrated in fish as well as in quadrupeds is acknowledged by the common usage of language. Do we not call men of a rapacious disposition “sharks;” and say of men of uncertain and cunning ways that they “wriggle like eels”? It seems certain, therefore, that the distinction here made, while perhaps having some foundation in the quality of the flesh, is primarily to illustrate disposition, and to guard the Jews against the selfishness and rapacity associated with the unclean fishes.

It could hardly be *locomotion* which is referred to in this animal kingdom, since some of the unclean fishes, for example, the sharks, are remarkable for their speed. Moreover, the fact of sharks and some other fishes having scales, though of almost microscopic character, is no argument against the fidelity of the record. The Law was given primarily to a people of simple and not scientific habits—not to microscopists. Its popular style and adaptation to common life are among its highest recommendations.

3. *Birds.* Here, again, when the words are looked carefully into, the distinction seems to be that clean birds are such as feed on grain and grasses, while the carnivorous birds are excluded as unclean. In no more striking way could *unholy appetites* be illustrated and condemned. Restraint and purity were thus inculcated.

4. *Reptiles.* Of these permission is given to eat four kinds of locust, all of which

<sup>1</sup> ‘Discours Laïques,’ p. 72.

are distinguished as *leapers*, and not *runners*. Locomotion in this case, rather than food, is the ground of the distinction. When besides, we remember the migratory character of these insects, there is conveyed an excellent illustration of the *stranger spirit*, which abhorts on earth only so far as is needful, and takes more kindly to the air. If God's people should be "strangers and pilgrims upon earth," if they should be setting their affections on things above, the locust tribes, which the Jews were allowed to eat, most admirably illustrated the required spirit.

On the other hand, the mole, the mouse, the lizard (*בָּשָׁר*, not "tortoise," as in English Version), gecko (*תְּפִירָה*, not "the ferret," as in English Version), monitor (*לְבָבָן*, from its great strength—not "the chameleon"), lizard and sand-lizard (*בָּשָׁרָה*, from lying on the ground—not "snail," for they are eaten by Jews and Orientals, as not unclean), and chameleon are to be regarded as unclean. Earthliness and ugliness—in one word, the repulsiveness of sin—seem indicated by this distinction.

We have thus inculcated, by this easy, popular division of the animals, important moral qualities to be cultivated and immoral qualities to be avoided. Animated nature became thus a mirror for human nature. The living world around man was thus made to take up a parabolic language and promote his sanctification.

IV. THE DEFILING CHARACTER OF DEATH THROUGH NATURAL CAUSES WAS TO BE CONSTANTLY RECOGNIZED. Even a clean animal which had died of itself was not to be eaten or touched with impunity. Defilement was the result of such contact. The lesson of mortality as the penalty of sin was thus illustrated. Men might devote an animal to death for sacrificial purposes or for their own use, but when death came as the debt of nature, at once its defiling character must be realized, and purification sought accordingly.

The laws of this chapter entailed constant watchfulness. No careless living was possible under the Jewish *régime*. In the same spirit surely should we "watch and pray, lest we enter into temptation." In the same spirit should we ask ourselves, What spiritual lessons is surrounding nature communicating to our spirits? Not in vain, and not for mere utility, has such an environment been thrown around us.—R. M. E.

Vers. 1—8.—*Clean and unclean*. As man is made after the image of God, so is the outward and sensible world constituted as a kind of apographa to represent the spiritual world which is the subject of faith (Rom. i. 20). The key to unlock the mysteries of this system is to be found in the Scriptures of truth; and animals, according to it, are to be viewed as representing men.

I. THE LAW DISTRIBUTES THEM INTO TWO CLASSES. 1. *The clean*. The marks of cleanliness are: (1) That they "divide the hoof." By the division of the hoof, as in the ox and sheep, the animal is able so to order its steps as not to throw up the mud upon itself, as the horse does whose hoof is not cloven. (2) They "chew the cud." So their food is more perfectly prepared for digestion. The manner in which this is done, while the creature rests, is so suggestive of thoughtfulness and meditation that it is described as *ruminating*. (3) The clean animals were therefore chosen to represent the Israelites, who were a holy nation. They were ceremonially holy: (a) So *walking* in the ways of God's commandments as not to be polluted with the abominations of idolatry. (b) So *meditating* upon the Law as inwardly to digest it to their nourishment (see Ps. i. 2; 1 Tim. iv. 13—15). (c) Thus also they became morally greatly superior to the nations around them. 2. *The unclean*. (1) The Gentiles in contrast to the Jews were so, ceremonially, and were therefore shut out from communion with the Jews. But it was competent to them to be made holy by becoming proselytes. (2) They were in general idolaters, and so morally abominable. It was mainly to keep the Israelites from being contaminated with the idolatries of their neighbours, that these laws were instituted (see ver. 45; xx. 23—25; Deut. xiv. 1—3). 3. *There are but two classes of men*. (1) Though some animals divide the hoof, they are not clean unless they also chew the cud. The hog is of this order, and is filthy to a proverb (2 Pet. i. 22). So it does not make men clean to have the faculty for walking cleanly when their disposition otherwise leads them to wallow in the mire of sin. (2) Though some chew the cud, yet if they divide not the hoof they are unclean. The "camel," the "coney," and the "hare," or whatever creature, the word *נְרָמָה* may describe, are of this order. For what good is the semblance of meditation and repentance, if the walk of the life be not clean (Jas. i. 20)?

(3) As there are varieties of clean and also of unclean animals, so are there varieties and degrees of goodness, on the one hand, and of wickedness on the other, amongst men. Still the classes are but two. The one is led by Christ, the other by Satan (Matt. xii. 30; xxv. 2, 32, 33). To which class do you belong?

II. THE LAW IN THE LETTER IS NOW CHANGED. 1. *The gospel is freely preached to the Gentiles.* (1) They are not now under obligation to be proselyted to Judaism. This subject was debated in the early Church, and settled at the Council of Jerusalem. (2) The same decision, which was at the instance of Peter to whom the Lord had assigned that distinction (see Matt. xvi. 19), released the Jews also from the yoke of the Law (see Acts xv.). 2. *This was according to prophetic indication.* (1) Under the figure of the unclean wolf dwelling with the lamb, etc., Isaiah (xi.) describes the Gentile and Jew as to be wonderfully reconciled in the days of Messiah. (2) To show that the Jew must have no fellowship with the Gentile, the Law forbade the yoking together of the clean ox with the unclean ass (Deut. xxii. 10). But prophecy anticipates the blessedness of the time when the seed, viz. of the gospel, should be sown beside all waters—not those of Judæa only, but of the wide world; and that in this business the ox and the ass—the Jew and the Gentile—should become fellow-workers (see Isa. xxxii. 20; comp. also Deut. xxv. 4; 1 Cor. ix. 9—11; 1 Tim. v. 18). 3. *Peter's vision instructed him that this time was come.* (1) The animals contained in the sheet were those described as *unclean* in the Law, and represented the Gentiles. Peter, therefore, when commanded to kill and eat, hesitated, for that he “had never eaten anything that was common or unclean.” He therefore held that “it was an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to keep company or come unto one of another nation.” (2) But the linen sheet which enclosed the animals was the emblem of purity; and they were thrice lifted into the heavens. To these symbols agreed also the voice which said, “What God hath cleansed that call not thou common.” (3) When therefore Peter had all this corroborated by the counter-vision of Cornelius, he was convinced that henceforth he “should not call any man common or unclean.” For the universality of the mercy of the gospel had been testified in that the sheet was knit at the four corners, showing that the Gentiles were to be gathered together from the four quarters of the world.

III. THE LAW IN ITS SPIRIT STILL ABIDES. 1. *For the gospel is that spirit.* (1) The glory on the face of Moses was veiled to the Jews. So concerned were they with the letter that they could not steadfastly look upon the true glory of their own Law. Moses therefore put a veil upon his face, viz. the veil of the letter. This veil is still upon their hearts, and must so remain until they turn to the Lord, or become converted to Christ. (2) When Moses turned to the Lord, from whom he derived his glory, he took off the veil; and it is the same glory which falls upon us. The only difference is that in the spirit of the Law we see the glory of the Lord reflected from the face of Moses; but in the spirit of the gospel we see the same glory as Moses himself saw it, immediately, in the face of Jesus. (3) Thus passing from the Law to the gospel, a spiritual person is changed from glory to glory. This brightening transfiguration is effected “by the Spirit of the Lord,” or, as the margin construes it, “by the Lord who is the Spirit,” viz. of the Law. The Spirit of the Lord is the Spirit of the Law. 2. *The gospel insists upon moral purity.* (1) We have seen that the law of yoking together the ox and the ass is repealed under the gospel. This was as to the letter. But we shall find it still insisted upon, viz. as to the spirit. For Paul clearly refers to it (2 Cor. vi. 14) when he forbids the unequal yoking together of Christians and infidels. (2) In the spirit of it Christ came not to destroy, but to fulfil, the Law, and that to the jot and tittle (Matt. v. 17—20). What a rebuke is here to the antinomian! What a stumbling-block to the Jew is the antinomianism in false theories of Christianity! Christians who neglect the study of the Law miss the benefit of many glorious views of precious gospel truth. How just is the remark of Augustine, that “the Old Testament, when rightly understood, is one great prophecy of the New”—J. A. M.

Vers. 9—12.—*The waters and their inhabitants.* “Here,” says Maimonides, “the exposition of this sentence, ‘A word spoken according to his two faces is as apples of gold in (מַשְׁׂכִּין) *maschyoth* of silver’ (Prov. xxv. 11). *Maschyoth* are a kind of *lattice* or *network* having very small interstices. Therefore ‘when a word spoken according to both its faces’ (that is, according to its exterior and interior signification) is likened

LEVITICUS.

N

to 'apples of gold in network of silver,' the meaning is that the exterior sense is good and precious as silver, but the interior is much more excellent as gold. An apple of gold covered with a silver network, viewed at a distance, seems to be all silver; but if by the worth and beauty of the silver you be attracted to view it more narrowly, you may discover the apple of gold that is veiled within. So are the words of the Law in the letter useful and excellent for direction in morals, or for the outward government of the Church, while the interior part or spirit is of superior excellence to build up the believer in the sublime mysteries of faith." According to this principle, let us consider here—

I. THE MYSTERY OF THE WATERS. 1. *They denote multitudes of peoples.* (1) This is expressed in such passages as Isa. iv. 5 and Rev. xvii. 15. (2) The reason, perhaps, is that they lave the shores of the earth and are the highway of commerce. At all times they sustain a multitude of navigators; and at one time, in the ark of Noah, the entire population of the world was afloat. (3) In the text the waters are distributed into "seas" and "rivers." 2. *The sea may be diversely considered.* (1) Before the formation of light, when its consistency was muddy, it was called the *deep*, or the *abyss*, and was the symbol of *hell* (Gen. i. 2; Luke viii. 31; Rom. x. 7; Rev. xx. 3). (2) Under the action of light, the earthly particles precipitated, and the upper portion became gradually clearer and more liquid. Then the mass received the name of "seas" (Gen. i. 10). In this condition the waters became stocked with living creatures and capable of supporting fleets, when it became a figure of the peoples of the world. (3) When disturbed by fierce winds, and the sediment from the bottom worked up, as if the abyss of hell had been moved, the state of the wicked is described (see Isa. lvii. 20). The winds by which the wicked are stirred are their passions, and the effects are turbulence and insurrection (see Ps. lxv. 7; cvii. 26; Jude 13). (4) We carry waves and storms within us; they threaten to drown us (Jas. i. 6); none can save us from ourselves but that Jesus who miraculously stilled the tempest (Matt. viii. 26). 3. *Rivers also may be variously considered.* (1) They are taken in a good sense when they keep their channels, for then they are sources of blessing. The river of Eden represented the *covenant* of God, which, branching into "four heads," showed how the blessings of the gospel were to be carried to the four quarters of the world (Gen. ii. 10; Psa. xxxvi. 8; xlvi. 4; lxv. 9; Rev. xxii. 1). The peaceful *people of the covenant* would also be represented. (2) Rivers are taken in a bad sense when they overflow their banks, in which case they become muddy, and carry desolation where they rush. Hence they are compared to invading armies and to ungodly men moved to violence (Judg. v. 21; Ps. lxix. 15; Isa. viii. 7, 8; xviii. 2; lix. 19; Rev. xii. 15).

II. THE INHABITANTS OF THE WATERS. 1. *The clean are distinguished by fins and scales.* (1) The fins are their instruments of locomotion. By means of these they rise to the surface and swim in purer water under the clearer light of the heavens. Thus they teach us that a holy people should be active, not in the darkness of sin and ignorance, but in the day of goodness and truth (John iii. 21; viii. 12; ix. 4, 5). (2) The scales, which have a beautiful metallic lustre, suggest the idea of armour; and, when the creature swims near the surface, these brilliantly reflect the glories of the sun. They teach us to "put on the armour of light" (Rom. xiii. 12; Eph. vi. 7). 2. *The unclean are those without fins and scales.* (1) Those destitute of both, like the eel, shun the light, and bury themselves in the mud at the bottom. They teach us to avoid the corresponding habits of the wicked, who rush into sin and ignorance and wallow in moral filth (Job xxiv. 13—17; John iii. 19, 20; Eph. v. 13). (2) Those who have fins but no scales are covered with a thick glutinous matter, which in appearance contrasts unfavourably with the silver and golden armour in which the clean creatures are clad. If they use their fins to rise out of their depths, it is to make havoc upon shoals of brighter creatures. So are the wicked bloodthirsty and voracious, who therefore should be shunned. (3) In the imagery of the prophets, anti-Christian kingdoms are sometimes described as great sea-monsters (see Dan. vii. 2, 3; Rev. xiii. 1). Such kingdoms must be held in abomination by the thoughtful student of the Law, and the time, earnestly longed for, when the Lamb will appear on Mount Sion.—J. A. M.

Vers. 13—25.—*Flying creatures.* So conflicting are the opinions of the learned as to many of the animals indicated in the Hebrew names in the verses before us, that it

appears hopeless to expect certainly to identify them. This fact in itself ought to convince the Jew that the Law, in the letter, is abolished; for he cannot tell whether he has not repeatedly eaten abominable things, or that contact with the carcases of such has not made him unclean. As to the spirit of the Law, there are broad indications of cleanliness and uncleanness to which we may profitably attend.

I. THE UNCLEAN ARE IN GENERAL BIRDS OF PREY. 1. *Conspicuous amongst these are the eagles.* (1) There is little doubt that first name (*עֵיטָרָה*) is truly rendered "eagle." The term expresses the propensity of that creature for *lacerating* and *tearing in pieces* the flesh of its prey. (2) Its associates in the group (vers. 13, 14) are similar in nature. The "ossifrage," or *bone-breaker*, is probably the sea-eagle, whose habit is to break bones to get at the marrow. The "osprey" has its name in the Hebrew from its *strength*, and is generally understood to be the *black eagle*. The "vulture"—if that truly renders the original—is one of the largest and most formidable of the eagle kind. And what is construed the "kite," being in the same group, is probably some other description of eagle. 2. *These are emblems of evil spirits.* (1) This, indeed, is true of all unclean birds, in proof of which see Matt. xiii. 4, compared with 19, and Rev. xviii. 2. They are so: (2) From their traversing the air (see Eph. ii. 2). This is eminently the case with eagles, whose flight is towering, and whose nests even are in inaccessible mountain heights. (3) From the formidableness of their attacks. From dizzy heights they swoop down upon their prey. They are armed with powerful talons, and strong, sharp, hooked beaks fitted to inflict dreadful wounds, tearing as they grip the flesh of their quivering victims (Job xxxix. 30). 3. *They also represent wicked men.* (1) Wicked men are the "children of Satan," and naturally exhibit the family likeness. The kings of Babylon and Tyre are compared to the eagle (Ezek. xvii. 3, 7). The persecutors of the people of God are likewise so compared (Lam. iv. 19). The Roman armies, whose standards were eagles, are called eagles by our Lord (Matt. xxiv. 28). (2) The lesson for us is to avoid the disposition of the wicked, and to beware of their relentless voracity and diabolical cruelty. God is stronger than the "powers of the air."

II. SOME UNCLEAN BIRDS ARE PROWLERS OF THE NIGHT. 1. *This characterizes the next group* (vers. 15—19). (1) The Hebrew name for the "raven" (*רַבֵּן*) is that commonly used for *evening*. Our name "raven" probably comes from their *ravening*. The raven Noah sent forth from the ark, which wandered to and fro, and resting upon floating carcases or what dry thing it could find, was an emblem of an unclean dark spirit, which is cast out from the Church of God, and from the hearts of his people, and wanders among the moral carcases, the dead in trespasses and sins (comp. Zech. xiii. 2; Matt. xii. 43). (2) Keep close to Jesus, lest, departing from him, we may invite this unclean spirit to return with seven others more wicked than himself. 2. *With the raven owls are associated* (vers. 16—19). (1) These are creatures whose vision will not endure the blaze of day, but who have wonderful sight in the dark. That rendered "hawk" has its name here (*רַחֲם*) from the *swiftness* of its flight; but in Dan. xiv. 13 (*רַחֲם*) from the sharpness of its *sight*. (2) They are distinguished from each other by particular habits. That in our version called the "night hawk" (*רַחֲם*) is the screech-owl. Its screams are violent; and these birds in general make fearful and doleful sounds in the night. This does not argue favourably for the happiness of evil spirits. (3) Wicked men also, like owls, hate the light. When honest people of the day are sleeping, these prowlers are plotting mischief. Witness the burglaries, the murders, the prostitutions, the debaucheries, practised by them under the cover of darkness.

III. UNCLEAN BIRDS ARE GROVELLING IN THEIR HABITS. 1. *Such are the "fowls that creep going upon all four."* (1) The bat is a creature of this class. It has claws attached to its leathern wings, which serve it instead of feet to crawl by. (2) This description includes also insects from which exceptions are taken in the verse following. 2. *They are types of wicked intelligences.* (1) Some devils have a passion for enshrining themselves in organic bodies. The incarnation of Satan in the serpent was not the last attempt. There were demoniacal possessions in our Lord's day; and when expelled from human beings, they preferred the bodies of swine to having no organic habitation. (2) Wicked men grovel in the most revolting moral filth. 3. *In what contrast to these are the good!* (1) The dove sent forth by Noah is a figure of the Spirit of God, the gracious

Messenger and Dispenser of peace to the Church; but who is often grieved by the impurities of men (Matt. iii. 16). The fruit of the Spirit, is peace; and those who exemplify it are called doves (Matt. x. 16). (2) The lark also is a clean creature, who soars high and sings gloriously in the light of the morning. How angelical! how saintly! (3) While winged insects that could not leap from the ground were unclean, to show that those men are morally so who are wholly given to the cares of this world; those with *benders* above their feet, in our version called "legs," those with crouching joints to stoop and spring with, as locusts and grasshoppers, for the opposite reason are clean. The Baptist lived principally upon locusts in the wilderness.—J. A. M.

Vera. 26—47.—*Unclean, creeping, and dead things.* It is evident, from the concluding verses of this chapter (see vera. 43, 44), that these laws were designed to teach the nature of the holiness of God. It therefore follows, unless that holiness consist in not eating the flesh or touching the carcases of certain creatures, which it would be absurd to suppose, these creatures must in their habits represent evils which men should abominate, and clean creatures, on the contrary, virtues which they should cultivate. Let us therefore seek the spiritual lessons from—

I. THE UNCLEAN CREEPING THINGS THAT CREEP. These are opposed to creeping things that leap, some of which are clean (see vera. 21, 22). Their steady attachment to the earth, never rising above it, represents an inveterate worldliness which a holy people must hold in abhorrence. Samples are given under the following groupings (see ver. 42), viz.: 1. *Those that have no feet*, "Whatsoever goeth upon the belly." (1) Serpents, snakes, vipers, and worms of all kinds are included under this description. The serpent has given its name to Satan ever since he enshrined himself in a creature of that kind (see Gen. iii. 1; 2 Cor. xi. 3; Rev. xii. 9; xx. 2). And wicked men are the "children of the devil," and so are described as the "seed of the serpent," and a "generation of vipers" (Gen. iii. 15; Matt. iii. 7). (2) Serpents are abominable for their unclean habits, lurking in the dust or mire, and eating their meat from the dust (Gen. iii. 14; Isa. lxv. 25; Micah vii. 17). Worms are bred in corruption and feast upon carrion (Exod. xvi. 20; Job vii. 5; xix. 24; Acts xii. 23). What a picture of those who wallow in sin! Serpents are double-tongued (Ps. cxi. 3), teaching us to abhor deception. They nourish poison, which is deadly (Numb. xxi. 9), teaching us to detest malignity (see Isa. xli. 24, margin; Rom. iii. 13). The worm of the damned dieth not (Isa. lxvi. 24; Mark ix. 44). 2. *Those that have four feet*, "Whatsoever goeth upon all four." (1) The weasel and the ferret are remarkable for their stealthy sliding motion in closing upon their prey. They teach us that slyness and treachery are an aggravation of violence, which should be held in abomination. The "mouse" (ver. 29) is to be taken as the representative of everything of the *mus* kind; but it is difficult to say what animal is meant by the word (2) rendered "tortoise." By some it is thought to be the *crocodile*; by others the *toad*. Its name indicates some habit of *swelling*, and may teach us to abominate all impudence, ostentation, and vanity. (2) The animal called "chameleon" (ver. 30) is by some thought to be the *mongoose*, a creature which eats snakes, rats, mice, and other vermin; while Bochart concludes that the *chameleon* is intended by the word we translate "mole." Creatures of the lizard kind, excepting the aquatic sort, such as the crocodile, live on flies. God makes some unclean creatures useful in exterminating others; so he deals amongst wicked nations, punishing them by one another in their turn. 3. *Those that have more feet.* (1) Under this description we have centipedes, caterpillars, perhaps, and innumerable creatures, with legs more in number than four. Amongst these there is scope for naturalists to describe qualities all which will convey moral lessons. (2) The one thing we mark in creatures that "multiply feet," as the Hebrew expresses it, is the slowness yet steadiness and stillness of their progress. The stealthy, insinuating false teachers who troubled the early Churches, and who have their representatives in modern times, are compared to these creeping things (see 2 Tim. iii. 6; Jude 4).

II. THE LAWS OF CONTAMINATION. These are ranged under two heads: 1. *The polluting of persons.* (1) This is done by their touching the carcase of an unclean creature. Whatsoever is unfit for food must not be touched (see Gen. iii. 3). Whom we cannot commune with we must avoid. (2) It may be done by their touching the carcase of a creature originally clean that has died of itself. Because in this case it

could not be a type of Christ, who died voluntarily, for he had no sin of his own to doom him to die. All intercourse of Christians should be in Christ, who is our life. 2. *The polluting of things.* (1) Vessels of any sort are rendered unclean by contact with the carcase of an unclean thing. These represent human beings in the capacity of servants, whether to God or man (Rom. ix. 21; 2 Tim. ii. 20, 21). Some being polluted are to be broken, to show that sin leads to destruction (Rom. ix. 22). Others may be purified by water, to show that sin may be removed by the sanctifying grace of the Spirit of God. There is a happy time coming (see Zech. xiv. 20, 21). (2) Clean meat may become polluted by contact with anything unclean. This law teaches that "evil communications corrupt good manners." (3) If an unclean thing fall into a fountain or well in which there is plenty of water, it does not render the water unclean (ver. 36). The living water is an emblem of the Holy Spirit, who cannot be rendered unholy by anything that sinners may do. For a like reason, perhaps, seed that is to be sown, which is a figure of Christ, cannot be rendered impure (ver. 37). But if water be put upon the seed for any other purpose, the figure is changed and the case is altered (ver. 38).—J. A. M.

Vers. 11-18.—*The abominable thing.* All the "unclean" animals were spoken of as "abominable." The Israelites were to learn to regard all creatures which were forbidden for food as offensive in their sight. Many of those prohibited were, for one reason or another, objects of natural aversion; fitting, therefore, to be types and pictures of "that abominable thing which God hates" (Jer. xlii. 4). Probably nothing in nature affords such a vivid conception of that which is loathsome and disgusting as certain members of the animal world. "The ugliness and spitefulness of the camel, . . . the filthy sensuality of the hog, the voracious appetency of the dog, the wolf, and the hyena, the savage ferocity of the tiger, the sluggishness of the sloth, the eagle-clutching innocence in its talons, the vulture gorging on putrescence, the slimy fish that creeps among the mud, the snake watching in the grass, the scaly thing that crawls on all the land and in all the sea;"—here we have a striking and almost terrible picture of the repulsiveness of sin. The training of the Hebrew mind to look on "unclean" animals with greatest aversion helped them to view sin in the light in which God would have us regard it, viz.—

I. **As a thing which he hates utterly.** "It is even an abomination unto him," it is "that abominable thing which he hates." He is "of purer eyes than to behold evil, and cannot look on iniquity." The falseness, the impurity, the grossness, the oppression, the selfishness, the profanity, the ingratitude of human nature, are as unendurable in God's sight—things from which he turns with as pained and troubled an eye—as are the most revolting actions of the unclean among the beasts of the field or the reptiles that crawl on the earth, in our esteem. Language fails to express the idea; the vilest habits of the lowest creatures will alone convey the thought of the repulsiveness of sin in the sight of God.

II. **As a thing which the Holy hate.** Holy angels, the "spirits of just men made perfect," holy men on earth,—all holy spirits, like the Holy One himself, hate sin, shrink from the sight of it, regard it "even as an abomination." David records for us his intolerance of iniquity (Ps. ci.). Peter tells us of the vexation of Lot's righteous soul with the unlawful deeds and filthy conversation of the wicked (2 Pet. ii. 7, 8). The message that comes from the attitude of the holy is, "Ye that love the Lord, hate evil" (Ps. xcvi. 10).

III. **As a thing which we must learn to hate.** 1. If we are numbered among the holy, we are hating sin; as far as our spirit is sanctified by the truth and by the Spirit of God, so far sin is to us "that abominable thing." 2. But we need to learn more of its hideousness, and to shrink from it with more of Divine repugnance. 3. And if we are practising any evil habit, and therefore cherishing it, and not only enduring but even loving it, there must come a time of disenchantment when the evil thing will assume to our eye its own hateful aspect. It is (1) a *painful* thing to consider that we may be, with so many others, liking that which we should be loathing; choosing and cherishing that which we should be indignantly repelling or expelling. (2) A *needful* thing to keep an open eye to see that to which we may now be blind; to be willing to learn that which our true friends may have to teach us; to be ready

and eager to receive enlightenment from God (Ps. cxxxix. 23). (3) *A fearful thing to think how many live and die in the love of that which is loathsome, and will only learn in retributive scenes what an abominable thing is sin.*—C.

Ver. 3.—*Health a duty as well as a blessing.* Undoubtedly there were moral and religious grounds for the legislation of this chapter (see subsequent Homilies). It was designed to express and convey religious truth. But we may well believe that the Divine purpose therein was, in part, sanitary. It was chiefly as the Father of their spirits and Sovereign of their souls that God thus spoke on the “clean and the unclean;” but it was also as the Author of their bodily frames. He desired that those who were to be known for ever as his people should be healthy in frame as well as pure in heart. The injunctions given in this chapter tended to that result. Those animals there allowed are the best fitted for food. Human science confirms, here as elsewhere, Divine instruction. “The grain-eating and ruminative animals, which divide the hoof and chew the cud, are altogether the most healthful and delightful for the table.” The flesh of swine, interdicted by sacred Law, has been proved to be the source of hurtful and repulsive maladies. No nation on earth has been healthier than the Hebrew. While providing for the religious education and moral security of his people, God was concerning himself for their bodily well being.

Health is the greatest of earthly blessings. Without it we can do little and enjoy nothing. With it we can accomplish much and triumph over almost every obstacle in our way. A sound constitution is a thing to be profoundly thankful for. But it is for us not only to accept this great gift thankfully, but also to guard it diligently and religiously. There are four reasons why we should regard it as a sacred duty to preserve the health of our body by those obvious means which are within our reach (activity, moderation, cleanliness, contentedness, etc.).

I. BECAUSE THE HUMAN BODY IS THE FAIR WORKMANSHIP OF GOD. That which our heavenly Father has made so exquisitely (Ps. cxxxix. 14) we should treat as a thing to be protected, to be preserved in its excellency. “Everything is beautiful in its season;” every period and phase of our humanity—smiling infancy, blithe childhood, sunny youth, vigorous young manhood, grave prime, grey-headed age, etc.

II. BECAUSE THE HUMAN BODY IS THE HOME AND ORGAN OF THE HUMAN SPIRIT. In our bodies we ourselves dwell—our thinking, reasoning, loving, hoping, striving selves. Our bodily faculties are the organs of our spiritual activities; therefore they are sacred.

III. BECAUSE THE HUMAN BODY IS THE DWELLING-PLACE OF THE HOLY GHOST. (1 Cor. iii. 16, 17; vi. 19, 20; 2 Cor. vi. 16).

IV. BECAUSE HEALTH IS A CONDITION OF USEFULNESS. It is true that men have been found (like Richard Baxter) to work for years in sickness and pain, but it is only a few rare spirits that can triumph thus over bodily infirmity. If we desire to bear the fullest possible witness and to do the noblest possible work for our God and our generation, we must not be indifferent to the state of our body. The stronger and healthier we are in our physical frame the more cheerful will be the tone of our spirit, the more attractive will be the aspect of our life, the more strenuous and the longer continued will be the labours of our hand.—C.

Vera. 4—47.—*Clean and unclean—a lesson on sin.* Why all these minute distinctions? Why disallow many creatures for food, the flesh of which is not unwholesome? What means all this elaborate system of the clean and the unclean, of that which may be taken and that which must be strictly and piously shunned? It was—

I. AN EARLY LESSON IN A RELIGIOUS SCHOOL. The people of God were in process of spiritual cultivation; they were being thus trained for our benefit, that they might give to all lands and times a body of sacred truth which it took them long to learn. God would, with this end in view, implant within them, deeply rooted, the idea of holiness. This distinction of clean from unclean was a daily lesson in sanctity, in the conception of separateness of the pure from the impure, of that which might be partaken of from that which might not be touched, of that which could be liked and chosen from that which was to be detested and avoided. They could not fail to understand, they could not fail to be profoundly impressed with the thought, that all around them were things which, for God’s sake, in obedience to his plain commandment, they

must shrink from and shun. So the idea of holiness, of sacred separation, of freedom from that which defiles (ver. 44), was planted within the soul, and grew in the nation; and it was ready when the time came for the great redeeming purpose of God to be revealed. There was a people well schooled in the essential idea of holiness.

II. A REMINDER OF THE PREVALENCE OF SIN. Connecting uncleanness, defilement, with so many living creatures, there would be before their eyes continual reminders of that which was evil; they would be constantly or frequently put in remembrance that they lived in a world of sin and danger. "All living nature . . . transmuted into a thousand tongues to remind and warn of sin and uncleanness. The living monitor would meet the devout Jew at every point, and call to him in words of sacred admonition from every direction. Looking out at his door, the passing of a camel or a bird of prey would be a memorial to him . . . to guard the approaches of uncleanness. Sitting down under his vine or fig tree, or going forth to gather flowers, the insects crawling on the leaves would be monitors of the presence of evil," etc. (Seiss).

III. A PICTURE OF THE MANY-SIDED NATURE OF SIN. The unclean animals being associated in his mind with sin, the Jew would naturally connect particular sins with those animals whose habits suggested the thought: the fox would remind him of the evil of treachery and low cunning; the tiger, of ferocity; the hog, of sensuality; the vulture, of gluttony, etc.; he would see before him living pictures of various forms of sin, and would be reminded that evil in every form, temptation in every phase, were about him, and that vigilance was needful at every hour of his life, at every step of his course.

We may learn from these thoughts: 1. That holiness includes, if it is not contained in, separateness of soul and life from that which is evil. Though not minute legal precepts, yet other voices say clearly, forcibly, imperatively to us, "Be ye separate; touch not the unclean thing." 2. That sin, with its taint and temptation, is on every hand; and not only all around us but, what is more and worse, within us. "Watch and pray," say the heavenly voices. 3. That sin is multiform in our day and land as it was in theirs. It approaches by every avenue, drapes itself in every costume, assumes every air and attitude, must be promptly recognized, wisely parried, stoutly fought, patiently and repeatedly subdued.—C.

Vers. 4—47.—*Clean and unclean—three side truths.* I. THAT GOD DOES SOME THINGS TO PROVE US. There were plain, palpable reasons of a sanitary or moral nature for many of these prohibitions; for many others there were, doubtless, valid reasons which escape our view. Probably some remain for which there was no reason in the nature of the case, but it seemed good to the Divine Ruler of Israel to issue them as tests of obedience. Such was the prohibition of the forbidden fruit in Eden. Such were certain statutes on other subjects. Occasionally these laws regulating the dietary must have been severely testing. The fisherman, e.g., must have been sometimes tried when he landed fine palatable fish which were forbidden, and which had to be cast again into the sea. God's dealing may seem arbitrary to us. Enough that he, our Father, who has given us so much, who has indeed given us everything we are and have, and to whom we are looking for everything we shall be and shall enjoy in the furthest future, holds out of reach or takes back again that which we would fain have or keep. God tries us, and we must submit with filial trustfulness and cheerfulness.

II. THAT IN DOUBTFUL CASES WE DO WELL TO ABSTAIN. "There was a difficulty in determining the case of the camel whether or not it really divides the hoof wholly, and the case of the hare whether it really chews the cud." These, however, are prohibited. We are often placed in circumstances in which we are doubtful as to the legality of pleasures to be enjoyed or profits to be realized. In such cases it is well to keep our "hands off." Abstinence will result in an infinitesimal loss; indulgence might end in serious mischief (see 1 Thess. v. 22).

III. THAT WE ARE MOST IMPORTANTLY AFFECTED BY THE THINGS WHICH WE APPROPRIATE. Stringent and detailed dietary laws may seem to us to be a redundant part of revelation. They would not have been added, probably, but for the direct religious aspect they wore. But, apart from their primary object, they teach us the valuable lesson that it is a matter of serious if not supreme importance to be appropriating right things every day. 1. *Right food for the body.* Many men are less devout,

less useful, less excellent and admirable in heart and life, because of the unguarded and intemperate way in which they eat and drink. We may be neither gluttons nor drunkards; yet we may lower our character and lessen our influence by ill-regulated appetite in eating and drinking. Profoundly true and urgently demanded as were the words of our Lord (Matt. xv. 11), "not that which goeth into the mouth defileth a man," we may be sure that Jesus Christ would have us exercise such self-restraint, and, if need be, such self-denial as will keep us from all grossness of thought and habit, from all degeneracy of spirit (Matt. xvi. 24; see 1 Cor. x. 31). 2. *Right thoughts for the mind.* That which the mind is appropriating, day by day, is determining its nature. It makes all the difference whether, mentally, we are eating and drinking that which is pure, wholesome, clean, refining, or that which is gross, noxious, unclean, deteriorating. How immeasurably important the companions we choose, the books we read, the conversations in which we indulge! 3. *Right resolutions for the soul.* The soul is entertaining desires and coming to conclusions, on larger and lesser things, every day. If these be unworthy, it is growing in evil; if these be honourable and excellent, it is growing in rectitude, in spiritual beauty, in usefulness, as the days and months go by.—C.

Vers. 46, 47.—*Clean and unclean—the abolition of the law.* “This is the law” (ver. 46). But “it is the law” no longer; consider—

I. **THE FACT THAT THIS LEVITICAL LAW HAS BEEN SET ASIDE.** 1. Perhaps by the word of our Lord in Mark vii. 15, especially taking the translation of ver. 19, “This he said, making all meats pure” (Farrar, ‘Life of Paul,’ vol. i. p. 276). 2. Certainly by the heavenly voice and the apostolic conduct (Acts x. 14, 48). 3. By united apostolic agreement (Acts xv. 22-29). 4. By inspired Epistles (1 Cor. viii. 8; Rom. xiv. 4; 1 Tim. iv. 3, 4). Clearly we are not under any obligation to observe these statutes. We learn from this our immunity—

II. **THAT SUCH PICTORIAL TEACHING IS NOT NOW NEEDED.** What moral and spiritual lessons were to be conveyed by these injunctions and by the habits of thought and deed they created, have been learnt; the rudimentary lesson is no longer needed. We are supposed to understand or to be able to learn in other ways what God means by holiness, how hateful sin is in his sight, how prevalent it is, how manifold in its shapes and colours, how sedulously it is to be avoided.

III. **THAT GOD TRUSTS US TO ACT ABRIGHT IN THIS MATTER OF BODILY NOURISHMENT.** The Law treated the race as if it were in its religious childhood; the gospel as if it had attained to manhood (Gal. iv. 1, 23). Christ our Lord trusts us to act wisely and faithfully. We must honour his Divine confidence in us. We shall do so by: 1. Intelligent study of what is really wholesome and health-giving. 2. Moderation in the use of that which is “good for food.” 3. Endeavour to make the body the active servant of the soul.—C.

Vers. 24-28, 39, 40.—*The significance of death.* “Whosoever toucheth the carcase shall be unclean.” What is the meaning of these minute and stringent regulations touching the dead bodies of animals, both clean (vers. 39, 40) and unclean (vers. 24-28)? The answer to this question is in the fourfold consideration—

I. **HOW MUCH GOD MAKES OF DEATH.** Death is the key-note of very much of sacred Scripture. “Thou shalt die” is a constantly recurring refrain. “And he died” is a continually repeated statement. It was the death of the slain victim at the altar that made expiation for the sinner. It is the death upon the cross which constitutes the sacrifice for the world’s sin. The death of the soul is the awful punishment of guilt hereafter as it is on earth. It was the death of these animals that made their carcases unclean. In the Old Testament and New, God makes much of death.

II. **THE SIGNIFICANCE OF DEATH.** Death is odious and intolerable in God’s sight: it must be made to seem so in man’s; for: 1. It is the *consequence of sin* in man. 2. It is the *picture of sin* in man. 3. It is a *reminder of the painful and hateful presence of sin in man.*

III. **THE AVOIDABILITY OF SIN.** The fact that the dead carcase could be and must be avoided, and that contraction of ceremonial defilement could be prevented, indicated to the Jew and now intimates to us that sin may be and must be shunned. Two

things were and are necessary: 1. *Carefulness*: scrupulous regard to the known laws (vers. 32, 34, 38). 2. *Self-sacrifice*: things made unclean must be broken up, disused, cast away, at whatever cost (vers. 33, 35).

IV. THE REMOVAL OF THE STAIN OF SIN. "It must be put into water; . . . so it shall be cleansed" (ver. 82). "There is a fountain filled with blood," etc.—C.

Ver. 44.—*Sacred separation*. "Ye shall therefore sanctify yourselves." The root-thought of sanctity is separateness. A man sanctifies himself when he separates himself from that which is evil and impure; so with a nation or a family. These strict laws concerning the clean and the unclean had important reference to—

I. NATIONAL SEPARATION. 1. God purposed to establish a holy nation. He designed, by various methods, to separate for himself a people free from the idolatry and the immorality of the race. 2. He therefore determined to separate Israel from international intercourse. The people of God were not to have any outside social relations, were not to intermarry with neighbouring nations. 3. Therefore, beside geographical obstacles and positive prohibitions, God interposed a precise and separating dietary. This created a strong barrier between his people and all others. The laws of food affect us powerfully in our social relations. Free intercourse is impossible without hospitality, and hospitality is impossible where distinctions as to eating and drinking are not only numerous but sacred and binding. A Hebrew could not sit down to the table of an Egyptian or an Arab without offending his host and sinning against his God. Moreover, such distinctions would generate and foster feelings of moral aversion toward those who did not observe them, and this would be another strong fence, helping to maintain separateness. The Jews may have carried this far beyond the original intention of the Divine Legislator; but at that point in the religious history of the world, all considerations were second, *longo intervallo*, to the one supreme end of keeping Israel separate and pure. God has, in his providence, divided the human race into nations by separating seas and mountains; there are many obvious advantages in this: it makes government, and therefore order and security, a possible thing. It makes possible national influence for good. How much of benefit and blessing to Europe and the world has arisen and will arise from the fact that he who is Lord of the sea and the rock has cut a channel and filled it with the dividing waters between the continent and this Heaven-taught land of ours (Ps. cxlvii. 20)!

II. FAMILY SEPARATION. "God setteth the solitary in families" (Ps. lxviii. 6). But he thereby not only makes the lonely to be social and joyous; he separates one small group of souls from all others. The family unites its members into one fellowship; it also divides the nation into separate circles. It is a fence which shuts out as well as it shuts in. It is one of the most imperative and sacred duties which God lays upon us who are parents to see that no injurious, no poisonous, no ruinous element, in the shape of a contaminating human soul, is admitted within the gates of family life.

III. INDIVIDUAL SEPARATION. With us (speaking generally) God wills how separate the nation shall be; the human parent determines how separate the family shall be; each individual soul must decide how separate he and his life shall be. There is a sin-stained, corrupted world encompassing us; we must choose, for ourselves, how far we will enter it, how free our intercourse with it shall be. There are, however, some general principles. 1. We must have something to do with it (John xvii. 15; 1 Cor. v. 9). 2. We must impose some restraints on ourselves; we must draw some lines of limitation; we must "sanctify (separate) ourselves." 3. We should refrain from familiar association with the openly ungodly; for by such familiarity we should identify ourselves with their principles and countenance their evil ways. 4. We should avoid intimacy with the irreligious and undecided; for if we mingle continually with those who walk on lower spiritual ground, we shall surely fall to their level (Prov. xiii. 20).—C.

Ver. 45.—*High reasons for holiness*. The height of human character depends on the nature of the motives by which men allow themselves to be governed. It is certain (1) that we are all actuated by a great variety of motives; (2) that we are affected by many considerations in our choice of the better path; (3) that of the right motives which actuate us some are much higher than others; (4) that while it is well to be

moved by every honourable impulse, we should seek to be mainly moved by the highest and best of all.

Here we have three of the highest possible motives for the best possible estate, three high reasons for holiness.

I. GOD, IN HIS SOVEREIGNTY, COMMANDS IT, AND IT IS OUR HIGHEST DUTY TO OBEY HIM. "I am . . . your God: ye shall" Duty is one of the highest of all considerations, if not positively the very highest. Our duty to obey God when he says "ye shall," is clearly the highest of all duties.

II. GOD HIMSELF IS THE HOLY ONE, AND IT IS OUR HIGHEST HONOUR TO BE LIKE HIM. "Ye shall be holy; for I am holy." He is the "Holy One of Israel," the "holy, holy, holy Lord God of hosts." "He is light, and in him is no darkness at all." There is no conceivable ambition man can cherish that is so high as the aspiration to be like God, the righteous Father of souls (see Matt. v. 48).

III. GOD, OUR REDEEMER, DESIRES IT, AND IT IS OUR HIGHEST SATISFACTION TO PLEASE HIM. "I am the Lord that bringeth you up out of the land of Egypt." If there were anything we desired to withhold from him who is "our God," the God from whom we came, to whom we belong, and before whom we stand, still there can be nothing we will keep back from him who is our Redeemer, who has "brought us out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage." "To Jesus, our Atoning Priest," we bring (1) our promptest and devoutest attention, (2) our unquestioning faith, (3) our most cheerful obedience. We run to keep his commandments.—C.

Ver. 45.—*Holiness and its requirements.* When a man has purified himself and taken upon himself vows of devotedness to God, then is he prepared to be the recipient of Divine communications. After Aaron's consecration, he is instructed both separately, and conjointly with Moses (ch. x. 8; xi. 1). The legislator and the priest act in harmony under a theocracy; the laws of God are the statutes of the nation.

I. THE SANCTIFICATION REQUIRED OF THE PEOPLE OF GOD. 1. *It is a necessary consequence of his character and of the relationship they sustain to him.* What the Master loves, the servant must love; what the King is, that his subjects become. Sanctity is the glory of God. To be untarnished, free from taint, this is his prerogative and separates him from all idol gods. Holiness is not so much one special attribute as the all-embracing purity, the bright cloud that invests his excellences with spotless splendour. Evil flies from his presence. Unless, therefore, his people manifest this separation from impurity, how can he take delight in them and bless them? Unless they reflect something of his image, how can he acknowledge them as his children? He says, "Be ye holy; for I am holy." 2. *The intention of God has been signified in delivering his people from bondage.* He declares himself Jehovah, the bringer-up of the Israelites from the land of Egypt, in order to be to them for a God (Elohim). This same design is expressed in ch. xx. 26, "I the Lord am holy, and have severed you from other people, that ye should be mine." To what purpose was the yoke of idolatrous sinful Egypt broken, if Israel remained impure and unholy? The intent of Jehovah would be frustrated. A similar line of argument is pursued in 1 Pet. i. 15—19, where the precept of the text is enforced by reference to the cost of redemption—not corruptible things, but the precious blood of Christ being the price of our ransom. We make the grace of God and the gift of his Son of none effect if we continue in the former sins. 3. *This same deliverance is appealed to as a claim upon his people's gratitude and obedience.* The very kindness of Jehovah in emancipating the nation and guiding them through the wilderness constituted a valid reason for abstaining from all that God forbade. Unworthy are they of being the recipients of mercy who do not feel themselves bound thereby to please this merciful Lord. Shall not the love of Christ constrain us to live unto him, acknowledging that we are henceforth not our own? Conduct actuated by such motives is not servitude. It accords with the dictates of reason, conscience, and emotion. Compared with the bondage from which Christ releases us his yoke is easy, and his burden light indeed.

II. WHAT THIS SANCTIFICATION INVOLVES. 1. *Adherence to distinctions unknown to the world in general.* Some animals were to be regarded as totally unfit for food, others unclean under certain conditions. It was not the business of these teachers to make the distinctions, but to explain and enforce them. The popular classification was

adopted—it would be the only one intelligible. *Even in trivial matters God's people are to be distinguished from the heathen.* These distinctions were not simply arbitrary; they depended on considerations sanitary, ethical, and instinctive. Thankful for the relief the gospel affords us from the burdensome ceremonies of the Law, knowing that "every creature of God is good," we have yet to do all, whether we eat or drink, to the glory of God. His gifts are to be received with thanksgiving, sanctified by the Word of God and prayer. We are not "subject to ordinances that perish with the using," yet are we to set our affection on things above, and to mortify our members which are upon the earth; observances which the majority of mankind practise not. The line of division between things pure and defiling is plainly marked if we apply our eyes to survey it. Others may call us bigoted, narrow-minded, straight-laced, but we prefer the commendation of our Master to the good-will of men. 2. *Possible loss of property.* How vexatious to an Israelite to be obliged to destroy a vessel because it was polluted (ver. 33), or a cooking-range (ver. 35), or some moistened seed (ver. 38)! Many like a religion that costs them nothing, that is not particular about trifles. Very real is that man's religion who refuses to employ ill-gotten gain or dishonest measures, and who would renounce connection with a firm rather than be a party to unjust proceedings. Pity that so much evil should be condoned and defiling association suffered for sake of the profit it brings! If thy hand or thy foot cause thee to stumble, cast it off. 3. *Continual care and trouble.* To touch a dead animal necessitated ablution of the clothes, and the vessel which should be accidentally made "unclean" must be thoroughly washed, and both man and utensil remained ceremonially unclean till the evening. At any moment an Israelite might be compelled to repair the inroads of pollution, and constant caution was requisite to abstain from needlessly incurring stain. The sanctity God desires is a life-long work, and lovers of ease had better not undertake it. To be like him who was "holy, undefiled, separate from sinners," is to take up the cross and deny one's self. "Watch and pray unceasingly" must be our motto. Thanks be to him who hath opened a "fountain for sin and uncleanness," wherein at all seasons we may bathe and come forth white as snow! Thus shall we show forth the praises of him who hath called us. Let us learn to welcome the opportunity of testifying our love to him who gave himself for us.—S. R. A.

Vers. 1-47.—*Holiness.* Ver. 45, "For I am the Lord that bringeth you up out of the land of Egypt, to be your God: ye shall therefore be holy, for I am holy."

I. **THE BASIS ON WHICH HOLINESS RESTS.** The Divine call. 1. All religion must find its real strength as well as its root in Divine love. "We love him because he first loved us." A redeemed life must be holy. "He that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as he is pure." We begin our holiness with the cross of Christ. He has cleansed us with his blood, therefore we must be clean. 2. The deliverance effected by God for his people is made the pledge of an eternal life by *the special covenant*, which separated them from all others. We must have fact and positive revelation and direct promise to fall back upon. He also calls us to himself, declares himself our God. He says, "Be ye holy; for I am holy." Likeness to God is our rule; fellowship with God is our strength and joy.

II. **THE NATURE AND METHOD OF HOLINESS.** 1. The holiness which God requires is *personal holiness*—holiness in life, manners, habits, food, everything which concerns the man himself. The distinctions of clean and unclean animals, etc., refer to natural laws of health and life. 2. Holiness must be the characteristic of *God's people as a community.* The laws of cleanliness separated the nation as a whole from other nations. They applied to all classes, and to every individual. The Church must be a holy Church. The lack of discipline is a terrible hindrance to the advance of religion. We must keep off the unclean. The covenant blessing will not be given unless the covenant law be observed. "Let a man examine himself." Defilement of sacred things is judgment to ourselves. 3. The holiness of this world's life is a promise and prediction of *the higher holiness* of the everlasting life. The clean and unclean animals were distinguished that the taint of death might be removed in the case of those fit for food. The distinction itself seemed to say all would be clean to you if it were not for death. When we are above the conditions of earthly life, then to be holy will be to be really like God—not in a mere negative purity of not being contaminated, not sinning; but

being spiritually created afresh, with immortal natures, with perfect hearts to serve God, with life interpenetrated by his Divine glory. The holiness of the best Christian on earth is but an imperfect thing, largely a holiness of external regulation and separation from the unclean; but the holiness of the angelic nature will be a real and positive participation of the Divine.—R.

### EXPOSITION.

#### CHAPTER XII.

**UNCLEANNESSES DERIVED FROM CHILDBIRTH.** As there is a natural disgust felt for some kinds of food, which serves as a foundation for the precepts of the last chapter, so there is an instinct which regards some of the concomitants of childbirth, and some diseases, as foul and defiling. In accordance with these instincts, purifying rites are commanded for the restoration of those affected to ceremonial cleanliness. These instincts and consequent regulations respecting women in childbirth are found in very many different nations. “The Hindoo law pronounced the mother of a new-born child to be impure for forty days, required the father to bathe as soon as the birth had taken place, and debarred the whole family for a period from religious rites, while they were ‘to confine themselves to an inward remembrance of the Deity;’ in a Brahmin family this rule extended to all relations within the fourth degree, for ten days, at the end of which they had to bathe. According to the Parsee law, the mother and child were bathed, and the mother had to live in seclusion for forty days, after which she had to undergo other purifying rites. The Arabs are said by Burckhardt to regard the mother as unclean for forty days. The ancient Greeks suffered neither childbirth nor death to take place within consecrated places; both mother and child were bathed, and the mother was not allowed to approach an altar for forty days. The term of forty days, it is evident, was generally regarded as a critical one for both the mother and the child. The day on which the Romans gave the name to the child—the eighth day for a girl, and the ninth for a boy—was called *lustricus dies*, ‘the day of purification,’ because certain lustral rites in behalf of the child were performed on the occasion,

and some sort of offering was made. The *amphidromia* of the Greeks was a similar illustration for the child, when the name was given, probably between the seventh and tenth days” (Clark).

Vers. 2-4.—She shall be unclean seven days. The mother is to be *unclean seven days*, and after that to be in the blood of her purifying three and thirty days (ver. 4). The difference between these two states may be seen by looking on to ch. xv. 19-28, and comparing that passage with ver. 4 of this chapter. In the first stage, during the seven days, she made all that she touched unclean; in the second stage, during the thirty-three days, she was only required to touch no hallowed thing, nor come into the sanctuary, as she was progressing towards cleanliness. The number of days during which she is to be altogether unclean is to be according to the days of the separation for her infirmity, that is, seven days, as in the case of her monthly courses (see ch. xv. 19). In the eighth day the flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised. The Levitical legislation recognizes the regulation as to the day of the circumcision made at the time of the covenant with Abraham. “And he that is eight days old (or a son of eight days) shall be circumcised among you, every man child in your generations” (Gen. xvii. 12). Until the days of her purifying be fulfilled. “When in a state of impurity, the Hebrews were forbidden to enter the sanctuary, to keep the Passover, and to partake of holy food, whether of sacrificial meat, of sacred offerings and gifts, or of shew-bread, because the clean only were fit to approach the holy God and all that appertains to him (Lev. vii. 19-21; xxii. 3; Numb. ix. 6; xviii. 11; 1 Sam. xxi. 5)” (Kalisch).

Ver. 5.—If she bear a maid child, then she shall be unclean two weeks; . . . and she shall continue in the blood of her purifying threescore and six days. The reason why the duration of the mother’s uncleanness is twice as long at a girl’s birth as at a boy’s, would appear to be that the uncleanness attached to the child as well as to the mother, but as the boy was placed in a state of ceremonial purity at once by the act of cir-

cumcision, which took place on the eighth day, he thereupon ceased to be unclean, and the mother's uncleanness alone remained; whereas in the case of a girl, both mother and child were unclean during the period that the former was "in the blood of her purifying," and therefore that period had to be doubly long. See Luke ii. 20, where the right reading is, "When the days of *their* purification, according to the Law of Moses, were accomplished." For eight days the infant Saviour submitted to legal uncleanness in "fulfilling all righteousness" (Matt. iii. 15), and therefore the whole forty days were spoken of as "the days of *their* purification."

Vers. 6, 7.—The previous verses having stated the conditions and the term of continuance of the uncleanness arising from childbirth, the three final verses describe the offerings to be made by the woman for her purification. She shall bring a lamb of the first year for a burnt offering, and a young

pigeon, or a turtle dove, for a sin offering. Two things are noticeable here: first, that the burnt offering, symbolizing self-devotion, is far more costly and important than the sin offering, which had not to be offered for any individual personal sin, but only for human sin, "which had been indirectly manifested in her bodily condition" (Keil); and secondly, that in this one case the sin offering appears to succeed the burnt offering instead of preceding it. No doubt the changed order is owing to the cause just mentioned; the idea of sin, though it may not be altogether put aside (Gen. iii. 16), is not to be prominent, as though it were peculiar to the special woman who was purified.

Ver. 8.—If she be not able to bring a lamb. A concession is made to poverty, which in later times appears to have been largely acted on. It was, as we know, taken advantage of by the mother of our Lord (Luke ii. 21).

### HOMILETICS.

Ver. 6.—Generation, conception, and birth, not having anything sinful necessarily connected with them, the sin offering in this case is rather an intimation of original sin than an atonement for actual sin; the "sorrow" attached to childbirth being especially connected with the fall of man as a result of Eve's share in bringing it about (Gen. iii. 16). There is nothing in the Bible to countenance ascetic or Manichean views of marriage intercourse. Where any prohibitory injunctions are given on the subject, the purpose is to avoid ceremonial, not moral, uncleanness (Exod. xix. 15; 1 Sam. xxi. 4; cf. ch. xv. 18).

Ver. 8.—Some fifteen hundred years after this law of purification after childbirth had been given to and by Moses, a man child was born in a country which did not at the time of the legislation of Moses belong to the Israelites, and which those whom Moses addressed had never seen. The country was Palestine, the city Bethlehem. The birth took place in a stable, for the mother was poor. For eight days she remained unclean, and on the eighth day the child was circumcised, and "his name was called Jesus" (Luke ii. 21). For thirty-three days longer she continued "in the blood of her purifying" (ch. xii. 4), and then "when the days of their purification according to the Law of Moses were accomplished, they brought him to Jerusalem, to present him to the Lord, and to offer a sacrifice, according to that which is said in the Law of the Lord" (Luke ii. 22, 24). Had the mother been wealthy, she would have offered a lamb for a burnt offering, and a young pigeon, or turtle dove, for a sin offering, but though of the house and lineage of David, she was poor, and her sacrifice was therefore "a pair of turtle doves, or two young pigeons"—one of the birds being for a burnt offering, betokening the devotion of her life afresh to God after the peril that she had gone through; the other for a sin offering, recognizing her share in the penalty of Eve as partaker in original sin. "On bringing her offering, she would enter the temple through 'the gate of the firstborn,' and stand in waiting at the gate of Nicanor, from the time that the incense was kindled on the golden altar. Behind her, in the court of the women, was the crowd of worshippers, while she herself, at the top of the Levites' steps, which led up to the great court, would witness all that passed in the sanctuary. At last one of the officiating priests would come to her at the gate of Nicanor, and take from her hand the poor's offering, which she had brought. The morning sacrifice was

ended, and but few would linger behind while the offering for her purification was actually made. She who brought it mingled prayer and thanksgiving with the service. And now the priest once more approached her, and, sprinkling her with the sacrificial blood, declared her cleansed. Her 'firstborn' was next redeemed at the hand of the priest with five shekels of silver; two benedictions being at the same time pronounced—one for the happy event which had enriched the family with a firstborn, the other for the law of redemption" (Edersheim, 'Temple Service'). It was probably as she descended the steps that Simeon took the babe from her arms, and blessed God and them, and that Anna "gave thanks likewise unto the Lord, and spake of him to all them that looked for redemption in Jerusalem" (Luke ii. 38). "And when they had performed all things according to the Law of the Lord, they returned into Galilee, to their own city Nazareth" (Luke ii. 39). Thus obediently did the virgin mother of the Lord submit herself to the regulations of the Levitical Law, and thus humbly and graciously did the infant Saviour begin from the day of his birth to "fulfil all righteousness" (Matt. iii. 15) in his own person, though by the hands of others.

Lessons—1. To obey the positive laws and to submit to the positive institutions of the religious community to which we belong. 2. To take measures, when we have even involuntarily and without sin on our part ceased to be in open communion with God and God's people, to recover that communion. 3. To see that the measures which we take with this end are appointed by God or by his authority, and are in accordance with his will. 4. To be sure that such steps as we take be accompanied by an acknowledgment of sin and a throwing ourselves for acceptance on the merits of the sacrifice of the cross (which is our sin offering), and a consecration of ourselves to God's service (which is our burnt offering).

#### HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

Vers. 1-8.—*The purification of the Church.* At the commencement of his treatise on this Book of Leviticus, Cyril of Alexandria truly says, that as the Word of God came into the world arrayed in flesh, in which bodily appearance he was seen of all, while his divinity was seen only by the elect; so has the written Word a letter, or outward sense, which is obvious to ordinary perception, and an inward meaning which must be spiritually discerned. According to this rule, the purification of the Church is the subject of the text, which is presented under two aspects. It is—

I. DISTRIBUTIVELY CONSIDERED. The necessity of the spiritual birth may be collected: 1. *From the impurity of the natural.* (1) This is expressed in the ceremonial uncleanness of the mother. In case of the birth of a son, she had to remain forty days in a state of impurity. During this period she must not touch any hallowed thing, else it became polluted; and she must not enter the holy place of the temple. In case her child were a daughter, the term of this uncleanness was doubled. "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?" (2) Her uncleanness is in her *blood*, which is the same as saying it is in her *nature*. To be "born of blood" is therefore a periphrasis for a natural birth in depravity, and it is consequently opposed to the spiritual birth (see John i. 13). (3) This maternal uncleanness is also described as her "*infirmity*," in allusion to the pain, sorrow, and weakness through which she passes; and calls to remembrance the curse upon the original offence (Gen. iii. 16). The birth amidst this "*infirmity*" shows the utter helplessness and sorrowfulness of our moral state by nature. (4) No wonder, then, that the child also should be accounted unclean. Until the eighth day he had no sign of the covenant upon him. But an infant could not have "sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression;" therefore this exclusion from the covenant from the birth evinces hereditary depravity and guilt (Ps. li. 5; Eph. ii. 3). 2. *From the rite of circumcision.* (1) It was the sign of introduction into the covenant of God (Gen. xvii. 9-14). This supposes a spiritual birth, since the pollutions of the natural birth excluded the child from the favour of God. (2) The sign expressed this moral change to be the cutting off all that was forward in fleshly desires (see Deut. x. 16; Rom. ii. 28, 29; Phil. iii. 3). These, however necessary to the natural man, must not rule us here; for when the seven days of the world are

over, they will be no more (see Matt. xxii. 30; 1 Cor. xv. 50; 2 Cor. v. 2-4; see also Homiletic notes on ch. ix. 1-7). (3) Hence, the "baptism of the Holy Spirit" is another way for expressing the "circumcision of the heart," and therefore it is called the "circumcision of Christ," or of Christianity (Col. ii. 11, 12). By parity of reason, the "baptism of water" corresponds to the "circumcision which is outward in the flesh." (4) Circumcision was proper to express the necessity of a spiritual birth in the dispensation of the covenant before Christ came, as it figured his sacrificial death (the "cutting off" of the "Holy Seed"), through which we claim the blessings of salvation. Now he has come, the type is fittingly abolished, and the baptismal water introduced, which is the emblem of the purifying spirit of the gospel.

II. COLLECTIVELY CONSIDERED. 1. *The Church is the mother of the children of God.* (1) Every man was intended to be a figure of Christ. The first man was such (Rom. v. 14). This privilege is shared by his male descendants (Gen. i. 26, 27; 1 Cor. xi. 7). So every woman was intended to be a figure of the Church of God (1 Cor. xi. 7-9). The marriage union, therefore, represents the union between Christ and his Church (Eph. v. 22-32). And the fruit of marriage should represent the children of God (see Isa. liv. 1-8; xlix. 20-23; Gal. iv. 25-31). (2) But all this may be reversed. Men, through perversity, may come to represent Belial rather than Christ. Women may become idolatrous, and represent an anti-Christian rather than a Christian Church. Thus Jezebel, who demoralized Ahab, became a type of those anti-Christian State Churches which demoralize the kings of the nations (see Rev. ii. 20-23; xvii.). 2. *In her present state she is impure.* (1) Under the Law she was far from perfect. The elaborate system of ceremonial purifications imposed upon her evinced this. Her history and the judgments she suffered go to the same conclusion. The uncleanness of the mother in the text is not an exaggerated picture. (2) Nor is she perfect under the gospel. The saints are in her. Many of her children have experienced the circumcision of the heart. But many more have only had that which is outward in the flesh. The "tares"—hypocrites and unbelievers—are mingled with the "wheat," a state of things which is destined to continue "until the harvest" (Matt. xiii. 30, 39). 3. *But she is in the process of her purification.* (1) The first stage in this process was marked by the rite of circumcision. During the time prior to that event, she was in her "separation," viz. from her husband and friends, and those in necessary attendance upon her were unclean. This indicates the great difference which the cutting off of the Great Purifier of his people makes to the spiritual liberty of the Church (Rom. vii. 1-4). (2) Still the period of her uncleanness was extended to forty days from the beginning. Her "separation" terminated on the eighth day, but during the whole period she must not eat the Passover, nor the peace offerings, nor come into the sanctuary (ver. 4). These forty days may be presumed to be similar in typical expression to the forty years of the Church in the wilderness before it was fit to enter Canaan (see Deut. viii. 2, 16). (3) In the case of the birth of a female this period of forty days was doubled. This may be designed to show that under the gospel, where the distinction of male and female is abolished (Gal. iii. 28; Col. iii. 11), still the wilderness state of the Church is continued. Our Lord was forty days upon earth before he entered into his glory, and in that state represented the state of the Church that is spiritually risen with him, but not yet glorified. (4) The entrance of the mother into the temple when her purification was perfected represented the state of the Church in heaven (see Eph. v. 27). The offerings with which she entered showed that her happiness is the purchase of the Redeemer's passion. Her feasting upon the holy things expressed those joys of the heavenly state elsewhere described as "the marriage supper of the Lamb" (Rev. xix. 7-9).—J. A. M.

*Born in sin.* Ch. xii.; cf. Gen. iii. 16; Ps. li. 5; Luke ii. 21-24; 1 Tim. ii. 15. From the division of the animals into clean and unclean, and the sanctity thereby inculcated, we are invited to proceed to those personal liabilities to uncleanness for which due rites were provided. The first of these takes life at its fountain-head, and refers to the uncleanness connected with birth. Motherhood involved a longer or shorter period of ceremonial separation—forty days in the case of a son, seventy days in the case of a daughter, after which a burnt offering and a sin offering are to be presented to the Lord, and atonement made for her that she may be clean.

I. LET US START WITH THE PHYSICAL FACT THAT NATURE HAS ASSOCIATED WITH CHILDBIRTH A SENSE ON THE MOTHER'S PART OF PERSONAL UNCLEANNESS. The "issue of her blood" (ver. 7) stamps the physical process with defilement. No mother can avoid this sense of personal uncleanness, not even the blessed Virgin (Luke iii. 22-24). Upon the fact it is needless to dwell.

II. THE MORAL COUNTERPART TO THIS IS THE FACT THAT SIN IS TRANSMITTED BY ORDINARY GENERATION. As David puts it in Ps. li. 5, "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me." From generation to generation is the legacy of evil transmitted. Hereditary sin must be recognized as a much wider phenomenon than "hereditary genius." The law of heredity must be accepted as at the bottom of human experience. If the mother, in spite of all her fondness for her babe, finds that she has transmitted sinful qualities; if this is the universal experience in ordinary generation, then the sense of uncleanness, physically induced, contracts a moral significance.

III. THERE IS AT THE SAME TIME A SENSE OF JOY AND TRIUMPH ASSOCIATED WITH THE BIRTH OF CHILDREN. If there is an element of sorrow and of judgment, as God indicates by his utterance at the Fall (Gen. iii. 16), there is also an element of triumph, caught from the "protevangelium," which speaks of victory through the woman's seed (Gen. iii. 15). Our Lord even speaks of it as an appropriate figure of the coming apostolic joy: "A woman when she is in travail hath sorrow, because her hour is come: but as soon as she is delivered of the child, she remembereth no more the anguish, for joy that a man is born into the world" (John xvi. 21). The sorrow is the preliminary of joy, the joy is its crown.

IV. THE TWO ELEMENTS OF JOY AND JUDGMENT HAD THEIR EXPRESSION IN THE BURNT AND SIN OFFERING THE MOTHER WAS DIRECTED TO PRESENT TO THE LORD. The ritual is the same whether it be a son or a daughter. The difference in the time of separation was due to a supposed physical fact that "a female child causes the mother more labour and a longer illness. This belief," continues Ewald, "(even though it may have little ground in fact), was itself caused by the well-known primitive disfavour with which the birth of a girl was regarded."<sup>1</sup> No moral significance is to be attached, therefore, to the difference in the duration of the mother's separation. But at the end of either period there is to be brought a burnt offering and a sin offering. The burnt offering is to be, if the mother can afford it, "a lamb of the first year," while the sin offering is only to be "a young pigeon" or a "turtledove." It is evident, therefore, that, while a poor mother might bring as her burnt offering a "turtledove" or "young pigeon," the ritual attaches emphasis to the burnt offering rather than to the sin offering. It has even been supposed that the burnt offering took precedence in the order of time in this particular instance. At all events, the *joy of consecration*, which the burnt offering expresses, is more emphatic in this ritual than the *atonement* for unavoidable defilement, which is expressed by the sin offering. The undertone of judgment is certainly discernible, but high above it sound the notes of grateful, holy joy. The mother rejoiced that, though unavoidably unclean in her child-bearing, the Lord had put away her uncleanness, and she was ready to dedicate herself and her child unto the Lord in the rite of the burnt offering.

V. THIS RITUAL RECEIVES PECULIAR EMPHASIS FROM ITS CELEBRATION BY THE VIRGIN MOTHER. Mary had the usual physical concomitants in the birth of Jesus, we have every reason to believe, the termination of which this ritual of purification was intended to celebrate. The sense of uncleanness was manifestly hers, since she enters upon the ritual as no exception to the general rule and law. Not only so, but Luke boldly states, "when the days of *their* purification, according to the Law of Moses, were fulfilled" (*τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ ἀτέλη, not ἀτέλης*), including Jesus along with Mary, for Oosterzee's notion that it is *Joseph* and Mary, not Jesus and Mary, will not satisfy the case. In what sense, then, was Jesus associated with his mother in a ritual of purification? It is certain that there was not transmitted to Jesus any sinful disposition or qualities, as in ordinary generation. His whole life belied this idea. He was "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners." But this does not prevent the idea being accepted that there was transmitted in his extraordinary generation *responsibility*

<sup>1</sup> Ewald's 'Antiquities of Israel,' p. 156; cf. also Wemse on 'The Ceremonial Law,' p. 5.

for human sin. In other words, Jesus Christ was born with a liability on account of the sins of others. Having entered into the human family, having condescended to be born, he became liable for the responsibilities and debts of the human family, and the ritual so regarded him. Not only so, but our Lord had entered upon his "bloody passion" when at eight days old he had passed through the painful operation of circumcision. The rites in the temple thirty-three days after only expressed in legal form the liability on account of human sin upon which he had already entered. But if the atonement of the sin offering has thus a distinctive meaning in this exceptional case, the burnt offering had also its fulfilment. Mary dedicated, not only herself, but her Son, according to the Law of the Lord, "Every male that openeth the womb shall be called holy to the Lord." Simeon and Anna recognized in the infant the dedicated Messiah. Thus did Mary, as mother of Jesus, fulfil all righteousness.

VI. WE ARE SURELY TAUGHT HERE THE GENERAL PRINCIPLE THAT IT IS THROUGH SORROW AND HUMILIATION THAT TRIUMPH IS REACHED. The hope of a triumphant woman's seed sustained Jewish mothers in their sorrow. They looked for salvation through child-bearing, according to the idea of the apostle (1 Tim. ii. 15). God's meaning was through the child-bearing (*ειδ τῆς τενύοντος*), that is, the motherhood of the Virgin. Yet the hope sustained multitudes of mothers in their agonies. At length the Conqueror of the devil appeared. He came as an infant, and braved the dangers of development, and became "the Man of sorrows," and passed through death to victory. To the same law we must constantly conform. Humiliation is the price of exaltation in the case of Jesus and of all his people. The apostles had their season of sorrow in connection with Christ's crucifixion, and so sore it was that our Lord does not hesitate to compare it to a woman's travail; but at Pentecost they got the joy and exhilaration which compensated for all. The law of the kingdom is that we enter it through much tribulation. "He that humbleth himself shall be exalted" (Luke xiv. 11). When we humble ourselves under a sense of sin, when we humble ourselves under a sense of unprofitableness, then are we treading the path which leads to power and triumph.—R. M. E.

Vers. 1-8.—*The statutes on maternity.* We may seek—

I. THE EXPLANATION OF THIS STATUTE. And we shall find the explanation (1) not in the notion that any actual sin is involved in it; (2) but in the fact that there is connected with it that which is painfully suggestive of sin. (There was nothing actually "unclean" in the camel or hare, but it was constituted so because it was fairly suggestive of it.) 1. The sorrow of maternity (John xvi. 21) points clearly to the primeval curse, and therefore to the primeval sin (Gen. iii. 16). 2. The birth of a human child means the entrance into the world of one in whom are the germs of sin (Ps. li. 5; lviii. 3; Eph. ii. 3). 3. Maternity suggests the sexual relation, and that suggests the abounding and baneful sin of impurity. Hence sin is associated with the birth of the human infant, and the physical condition (ver. 7) attending it is typical of sin, constitutes "uncleanness," and necessitates purification.

II. THE THOUGHTS WE GAIN FROM THIS STATUTE. We learn: 1. *The communicativeness of sin.* We transmit our follies, our errors, our iniquities, by ordinary generation. Our children, because they are our children, will go astray, and will be in danger of those very errors into which we ourselves have fallen. Those who become parents must take the responsibility of bringing into the world children like themselves, who will inherit their dispositions, their habits of thought, their character. Sin is communicated from generation to generation through heredity, and also through the contagiousness of evil example. There is nothing more diffusive. 2. *The extension of the consequences of sin.* How sin sends forth its stream of sorrow! The pangs of maternity, answered by the opening cry of the infant as it enters the world—do these not speak the truth, that a world of sin is a world of sorrow, that succeeding generations of sinners are succeeding generations of sufferers, and that this will be so to the end of the world? 3. *The removableness of guilt from the sight of God.* The "uncleanness" of the mother was not irremovable. It did temporarily but did not permanently separate her from the sanctuary (ver. 4). After a limited retirement she might come with her sin offering and her burnt offering to "the door of the tabernacle" (ver. 6). If she were poor she might bring an offering within the reach of the poorest

(ver. 8), and the priest would "make atonement," and she would "be clean" (ver. 8). Whatever guilt we contract, whether in communicating evil to others or as the indirect consequence of the sin of others, by whatsoever our souls have been defiled, our lives stained and corrupted, we may all come to the cross of the Redeemer, and through his atoning sacrifice be made clean in the sight of God. And thus coming, our sin offering will not be unaccompanied by a burnt offering; the forgiveness of our sin will be followed by the dedication of our whole selves to the service of the Lord.—C.

Vers. 2-7.—*Woman under the Law and under the gospel.* Every childbirth re-echoes in the ears of woman the sentence passed upon her ancestress Eve. That such a season of rejoicing should be attended with such throes of agony speaks loudly of the curse entailed by sin. There is no earthly pleasure entirely free from its shadow, pain. Great movements of society, deep thoughts, even inspiring melodies, are not ushered into the world without the pangs of travail.

I. THE LAW REMINDS US HERE OF WOMAN'S CONNECTION WITH THE PRIMAL SIN. 1. She is to be considered "unclean" for a fixed period after bringing forth a child. In the first part of "separation for her infirmity," she communicates defilement to whatever she touches, and must therefore, as far as possible, remain apart. But in the succeeding thirty-three or sixty-six "days of her purifying," she may fulfil her domestic duties, only she must not come into contact with hallowed things, not partake of sacrificial meals, nor enter the sanctuary. Thus the fulfilment of her maternal hopes renders her unfit for a season to join in the worship of the holy God. She is led to rejoice with trembling; she is at once exalted and depressed. She sees that the new life is not separate from corruption, is allied to uncleanness and death, and in order to be redeemed requires hallowing by obedience to God's ordinances. 2. To cleanse the mother from the stains of childbirth and to allow of restored fellowship with God, atonement is requisite. First a burnt offering, that the life spared and secluded temporarily may be wholly surrendered in spirit to the Author and Sustainer of life. Then a sin offering to expiate all ceremonial offences connected with the begetting of children. If these rites appertain simply to the parent, yet must the knowledge of them afterwards acquaint the child with the state of separation from God into which it was the unwitting instrument of introducing the parent, and there is at least a hint that the origin of life is not free from taint.

II. THE LAW INDICATES THE INFERIOR ESTEEM IN WHICH WOMAN WAS ANCIENTLY HELD. 1. The uncleanness contracted by bearing a female child lasted twice as long as when a boy was born. This has indeed been explained on physiological grounds, as formerly maintained. But there is ample warrant for the other view (see 1 Sam. i. 11; Jer. xx. 15, and John xvi. 21, for the joy caused by the birth of a male child). In ch. xxvii. 5, the female is esteemed at half the price of the male. Each mother of a male might cherish the hope that to her was granted the promised seed—the Messiah. 2. No rite of initiation into the covenant for the female. The Jews regarded circumcision as the badge of honour, the mark of privilege and blessing. Woman entered the nation without special recognition. She was not capable of becoming the head of a family, on whose proved nationality so much depended, for if she married she became a member of her husband's family.

III. THE GOSPEL DIGNIFIES THE POSITION OF WOMAN. 1. It abolishes before the Lord distinctions of sex. "There is neither male nor female; ye are all one in Christ Jesus." "There is neither circumcision nor uncircumcision." Woman has equal rights with man, saving only what natural modesty forbids her claiming, and what is the general law promulgated from the first (Gen. iii. 16), that the husband shall rule over her. Both men and women are baptized (Acts viii. 12) and endowed with the Spirit. 2. It is the glory of woman to have been the medium of the incarnation of the Son of God. Her shame is removed. Even the poverty of woman is ennobled by the example of the Virgin Mary bringing her "pair of turtle-doves or two young pigeons." 3. Woman's quick appreciation of truth and steadfast fidelity are specially notable under the preaching of Christ and the apostles. Ready to adore the Lord as an infant, to supply his wants during his ministry, to bathe his feet with repentant, grateful tears, to anoint him before his burial, to follow him on the road to Calvary, to be nearest to him at the cross, and the first at his grave on the Resurrection morn, woman occupies

a place in the gospel records alike conspicuous and honourable. Nor are the faith and love and devotion of woman less marked in the Acts and the Epistles. Well has woman striven to erase the stigma of the first transgression. Eighteen centuries of the continually progressive elevation of woman in the social and mental scale have only attested the cardinal principles of Christianity. The position of woman in any nation now serves as an index to the stage of civilization which it has reached.—S. R. A.

Chs. xii.—xv.—*Ceremonial purifications.* For defilement from secretions and from leprosy. The double object—to exalt the sacred laws, to honour the natural laws of health and cleanliness. Thus we are taught—

I. RELIGION PRESERVES, PURIFIES, EXALTS HUMAN NATURE. The facts of family life are to be connected with the sanctuary. The more we think of both the joyful and the sorrowful events of our individual and social life as intimately bound up with our religion, the better we shall be prepared to find God's blessing always both preserving and sanctifying.

II. ALL REGULATIONS WHICH CONCERN THE BODILY LIFE AND THE TEMPORAL HAPPINESS OF MEN SHOULD BE SURROUNDED WITH RELIGIOUS REVERENCE. Science is a curse to the world unless it is the handmaid to religion. Our bodies are the temples of the Holy Ghost. Our earthly life is the threshold of eternity.

III. TYPICALLY. Leprosy represents human depravity and misery. We see it brought into relation to the cleansing blood of atonement. The sin which works death both by the individual acts and by contact with others, both in person and in condition, is cleansed away both in guilt and in power. The leper is not excluded from mercy, but is dealt with by the priest as having his place in the covenant. Our vileness does not shut us out from the love of God, but his love is revealed as an atoning love. "He is able to save unto the uttermost," but it is "those who come unto God by him."—R.

## EXPOSITION.

### CHAPTER XIII.

UNCLEANNESS DERIVED FROM LEPROSY OR CONTACT WITH LEPROS AND LEPROTIC THINGS (chs. xiii., xiv.). A third cause of uncleanness is found in a third class of offensive or repulsive objects. There is no disease which produces so foul an appearance in the human form as leprosy. There was, therefore, no disease so suitable for creating ceremonial, because representing spiritual, uncleanness.

The name leprosy has been made to cover a number of diseases similar but not identical in character. There are many spurious forms of leprosy, and many diseases akin to leprosy which do not now come under discussion. The disease here dealt with is elephantiasis, especially in its anaesthetic form, which is otherwise called white leprosy. The two varieties of elephantiasis—the tuberculated and the anaesthetic—are, however, so closely connected together that they cannot be separated, the one often running into the other. The first symptom of the

malady is a painless spot, which covers an indolent ulcer. This ulcer may continue unprogressive for months or for years, during which the person affected is able to do his ordinary business; but at the end of these periods, whether longer or shorter, it produces a more repulsive and foul disfigurement of the human face and frame than any known disease, the features of the face changing their character, and part of the body occasionally mortifying and dropping off. Death at last comes suddenly, when a vital part of the body has been affected.

The home of leprosy has in all ages been Syria and Egypt and the countries adjacent to them, but Europe has not escaped the scourge. In the Middle Ages, no European country was free from it; London had at one time six leper houses; cases were found not unfrequently in Scotland till the middle of the last century; and there was a death certified by medical science to have resulted from leprosy in the city of Norwich in the

year 1880.<sup>1</sup> The object of the regulations relating to leprosy is no more sanitary than of those relating to unclean meats. Like the latter, they may have served a sanitary purpose, for leprosy is, according to the prevailing medical opinion, slightly, though only slightly, contagious. Because leprosy was hideous and foul, it therefore made the man affected by it unclean, and before he could be restored to communion with God and his people, he must be certified by God's priest to be delivered from the disease. As in the previous cases, physical ugliness and defilement represent spiritual depravity and viciousness. "The Levitical law concerning leprosy reveals to us the true nature of sin. It shows its hideousness and its foulness, and fills us with shame, hatred, and loathing for it. And it reveals to us the inestimable benefit which we have received from the incarnation of the Son of God, 'the Sun of Righteousness, with healing in his wings' (Mal. iv. 2); and fills us with joy, thankfulness, and love to him for his infinite goodness to us" (Wordsworth). Leprosy, the most loathsome of all common diseases, is the type and symbol of sin, and the ceremonial uncleanness attaching to it is a parable of the moral foulness of sin.

Ver. 2.—The word translated *plague* of leprosy literally means *stroke*. It seems to be used in the sense of *spot*. Then shall he be brought unto Aaron the priest. That the regulations respecting leprosy were not sanitary arrangements, as has been sometimes represented, is indicated by the authority over the leper being vested in the priest rather than in the physician, and the question of whether a man was a leper or no being decided by the former rather than the latter. It is to be noted also that the priest is not made unclean by his contact with the leper, because he is in the performance of his duty. The supposed leper may be brought either to Aaron or unto one

of his sons the priests; that is, to the high priest or to the ordinary priest, and those descendants of Aaron who were disqualified by physical infirmities from officiating at the altar were permitted to act as examiners in leprosy.

Ver. 3.—When the hair in the plague is turned white. This is the first symptom, and the most noticeable as the commencement of the disease. The hair around the spot loses its colour and becomes thin and weak, the separate hairs being hardly stronger or individually thicker than down. The second symptom is when the plague in sight be deeper than the skin of his flesh; that is, below the upper skin, or cuticle, and in the real cutis. These two symptoms distinguish real leprosy from other affections which at first bear a similar appearance.

Ver. 4—8.—In case the symptoms are not decisive, then the priest shall shut up him that hath the plague *seven days*. The words thus translated would perhaps be better rendered, *then the priest shall bind up the part affected for seven days*. The priest is to delay his judgment for a week, and, if necessary, for a second week, during which period the patient is, according to the rendering, either to be confined to his house or, more probably, to have the spot bandaged. Whether the disease be or be not leprosy will probably have declared itself by the end of that time; and if the plague be somewhat dark on the fourteenth day, that is, if it has begun to lose its colour and to fade away, and has not spread in the skin, the priest is to decide that it is not real leprosy, and pronounce the man clean. He is still, however, to be kept under supervision, and if the spot is found to spread, he is to be pronounced *unclean*, as it is proved to be a leprosy.

Ver. 9—11.—The method of procedure in the case of a doubtful leprosy having been laid down in the previous verses, the rule for dealing with an unmistakable case is here given. When the characteristic white spot and white hair are present (if the rising be white in the skin, and it have turned the hair white), and if a third symptom be present—if there be *quiek raw flesh in the rising*, that is, if there be an

<sup>1</sup> The following description is given by the physician who attended the sufferer:—"The case of leprosy occurred in a man aged fifty-eight. He had suffered for many years from a severe scaly disease of his skin; the last two or three years of his life it assumed the form of true leprosy, such as one reads of as having occurred in former times. His skin became thick, hard, and hypertrophical, and formed one mass of large scales, covering the whole of his body, including his face and head, both of which were greatly swollen; indeed, he seemed as if he were encased in a large scaly envelope. The movement of his joints produced deep, painful, and bleeding fissures. The nails also became misshapen, rough, and ragged, and were replaced by scaly crustations. After lingering for some months in this condition, he died in November, 1880. I believe the case was a typical case of leprosy, or as nearly allied to it as possible."

ulcer underneath the white scab, there is to be no delay, as in the previous case, but judgment is to be passed at once. The priest shall pronounce him unclean, and shall not shut him up: for he is manifestly unclean.

Vers. 12—17.—If a leprosy break out abroad . . . and cover all the skin. There was a form of disease similar to true leprosy, and bearing the name of leprosy, and by some thought to be the final phase of true leprosy, which was yet not to cause legal uncleanness. It was distinguishable from the leprosy which caused uncleanness by a diffusion of the white flakes over the whole body, and by the absence of any patches bearing the appearance of raw flesh (vers. 12, 13). Real leprosy might pass into this harmless kind or phase, and it was known to have done so as soon as the raw patches of flesh had disappeared (vers. 16, 17). When this had taken place, the priest pronounced him clean.

Vers. 18—23.—The method of discriminating between a leprous spot and the reappearing scar of an old ulcer. A reappearing ulcer is to be regarded as leprous if it have the characteristic marks of leprosy; that is, if it be below the cuticle, and the hairs round it are turned white. If it has not these marks, it has to be watched for seven days, and if in that time it does not spread, it is to be declared a burning boil, or rather *an ulcerous scar*, in which case the priest shall pronounce him clean.

Vers. 24—28.—The method of discriminating between a leprous spot and the scar of a burn. If there be any flesh, in the skin whereof there is a hot burning. This rendering indicates that the authors of the Authorized Version thought a disease of the nature of a carbuncle to be meant; but it is better to take the words literally as they are translated in the margin, *If there be any flesh, in the skin whereof there is a burning of fire*; that is, a scar from a burn. The leprous spot and the scar are to be distinguished as in the previous case. An old ulcer or burn is a more likely place for a leprous spot to appear than any part of the body which is sound, just as in the moral sphere sin fixes on some old wound of the soul to burst out in.

Vers. 29—37.—The method of discriminating between a leprous spot on the head or beard and an ulcer in the same place. The symptoms of leprosy are the same as before, except that the hairs in this case are of a reddish-yellow colour instead of white. The treatment is also the same, with the addition of shaving the head or beard except at the place where the suspicious spot has appeared. In ver. 31 the priest is ordered to shut up (or bandage) the patient, if (1)

the spot be only in the upper cuticle, and (2) there is no black hair in it. We should have expected rather from the second condition *if there be black hair in it*, or *if there be no yellow hair in it*; and Keil accordingly proposes to omit the negative or to change the word "black" for "yellow," the two words in the original being easily interchangeable. The present reading is, however, defensible. The fact of the spot being not below the cuticle was a very favourable symptom; there being no black hair was a very unfavourable symptom. Under these circumstances, the priest delays his judgment in the ordinary way.

Vers. 38, 39.—The method of discriminating between leprous spots and freckled spots. In case the spots in the skin of their flesh be darkish white; that is, of a dull or pale white, then it is only a freckled spot that groweth in the skin. This is "the harmless *bōhāk* (ἀλφός, LXX.), which did not defile, and which even the Arabs, who still call it *bōhāk*, consider harmless. It is an eruption upon the skin, appearing in somewhat elevated spots or rings of unequal sizes and a pale white colour, which do not change the hair; it causes no inconvenience, and lasts from two months to two years" (Keil). The man or woman who has this is clean.

Vers. 40—44.—Leprosy appearing on the bald head. Though leprosy makes the hair drop off around the leprous spot, baldness is in itself no sign of leprosy, whether at the back or front of the head (vers. 40, 41); but as the bald head is a not unusual place for the leprous spot to appear, any eruption upon it is therefore to be watched and tested as before.

Vers. 45, 46.—The cases for examination having been discussed, the law for the treatment of the man in whom leprosy has been proved to exist is pronounced. The leper in whom the plague is to be excluded from the camp, lest others should contract defilement from him. He is for the same reason to cry, Unclean, unclean, lest any wayfarer should unwittingly come in contact with him; and his clothes shall be rent, and his head bare, and he shall put a covering upon his upper lip, these being the signs of mourning for the dead. The bared or dishevelled head (see ch. x. 6) and the covered lip are incidentally mentioned as signs of mourning in Ezek. xxiv. 17, and the covered upper lip as a mark of shame in Micah iii. 7. By the expression, He shall dwell alone, is meant he shall dwell apart from those who were clean. Of course, lepers would naturally associate with each other, and so we find that they actually did (Luke xvi. 12). As their presence was supposed to defile any

place that they entered, they were punished in later times with forty stripes if they did not observe the restraints laid down for them. "They were, however, admitted to the synagogue, where a place was railed off for them, ten handbreadths high and four cubits wide, on condition of their entering the house of worship before the rest of the congregation and leaving it after them" (Edersheim, 'Temple Service'). The exclu-

sion of the leper was not for the purpose of avoiding contagion, nor to serve as a penalty for having contracted so loathsome a disease, but primarily to prevent the spread of ceremonial uncleanness communicated by his touch, and typically and mystically to teach that the fate brought upon a man by unremoved sin is separation from the people of God here and hereafter.

### HOMILETICS.

Vera. 1-44.—*Leprosy is regarded as the type of sin in a more especial way than other foul and ugly things. Affections of the body often serve as means of representing to ourselves the affections of the mind. This is witnessed to by ordinary language. The words, "see," "perceive," "feel," originally expressive of bodily acts, have come to signify mental acts, and so in other cases, "healthy," "diseased," "upright," "debased," are words which we apply to men in their moral even more than in their physical capacity (cf. Isa. i. 5, 6, "The whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint. From the sole of the foot even unto the head there is no soundness in it; but wounds, and bruises, and putrifying sores: they have not been closed, neither bound up, neither mollified with ointment"). Points of similarity between leprosy as it affects the body and sin as it affects the soul are—*

I. **ITS MYSTERIOUS ORIGIN.** Whether by hereditary transmission or for other untraceable causes, it makes its appearance in the flesh of those whom it attacks without any special personal act of theirs to have brought it on.

II. **ITS SLIGHT BEGINNING.** It appears to be as nothing—as a mere spot in the skin, such as often comes and goes without injury.

III. **ITS PAINLESSNESS IN ITS FIRST STAGES.** It does not interfere with the common pleasures or occupations of life. There is a spot which a keen eye may observe, but it causes no trouble, and men go on anticipating no evil from it.

IV. **THE SLOWNESS OF ITS GROWTH.** "Sometimes months, sometimes years, even to the extent of twenty or thirty years, intervene between the first appearance of the spots and their development" (Gardiner). "Very frequently, even for years, before the actual outbreak of the disease itself, white yellowish spots are seen lying deep in the skin" (Trusen, 'Krankheiten der Alten Hebr.'). In other cases it develops more rapidly, according to the part of the body in which it has fixed itself, and the general health of the patient.

V. **ITS INSIDIOUSNESS.** After it has long continued without producing mischief, the person affected recovers hope, and thinks that no harm will come of it, but the evil remains, and waits its time for exhibiting itself, hiding itself meantime and lingering in the system.

VI. **ITS RESISTLESS PROGRESS IF NOT ERADICATED IMMEDIATELY THAT IT APPEARS.** "It is asserted that it yields to medical treatment in its earliest stages, when the spots first appear, and a number of distinct cases of cure are recorded. After the leprosy has once acquired a certain degree of development, there is no known means of cure. Everything hitherto attempted has been found to rather aggravate than mitigate the disorder. It is certain that, after it has once become developed to any considerable extent, it is incurable by any remedies at present known, although spontaneous cures do sometimes occur" (Gardiner).

VII. **ITS FINAL HIDEOUSNESS.** First it affects the hair around the spot, and changes its colour and its character till at last it falls off. "The spots afterwards pierce through the cellular tissues and reach the muscles and bone. Hard gelatinous swellings are formed in the cellular tissue; the skin gets hard, rough, and seamy, lymph exudes from it, and forms large scabs, which fall off from time to time, and under these there are often offensive running sores. The nails then swell, curl up, and fall off, *entropium* is formed, with bleeding gums, the nose stopped up, and a con-

siderable flow of saliva" (Trusen). "A characteristic of the disease is the horribly repulsive features of its later stages, when the face becomes shockingly disfigured, and often the separate joints of the body become mortified and drop off one by one" (Gardiner).

VIII. THE SUFFERING ENTAILED BY IT AT LAST. As if to make up for the painlessness of its earlier stages, it not only causes in its final stage a constant pain of body, but a distress of mind and horror on the part of the sufferer at having become so loathsome and offensive an object to himself and to others.

IX. ITS UNEXPECTED ENDING. "A characteristic of the disease is its usually sudden and unexpected termination at the last, when the leprosy reaches some vital organ, and gives rise to secondary disease, often dysentery, by which life is ended" (Gardiner). "The patient gets thin and weak, diarrhoea sets in, and incessant thirst and burning fever terminate his sufferings" (Trusen).

X. ITS LIKENESS TO A LIVING DEATH. "Leprosy was not merely the emblem of sin, but of death, to which, so to speak, it stood related, as does our actual sinfulness to our state of sin and death before God. A rabbinical saying ranks lepers with those who may be regarded as dead" (Edersheim).

In all these respects, by the bodily state of the leper was manifested and parabolically set forth the state of the soul given up to the dominion of sin. Like leprosy, sin springs up mysteriously in the heart, owing to some previously existing corruption; at first it does not cause pain, but it promises pleasure, and gives some enjoyment to the senses; its true character is often not developed for years, but it gradually takes more and more possession of the soul, till it becomes unconquerable by any internal or human power; then it shows itself in its true form, repulsive instead of attractive, full of pain instead of pleasure, ending in a sudden destruction and a death of the soul.

CONCLUSION. 1. Negative. Avoid those things which will bring the soul into a state analogous to the leprous body. "Enter not into the path of the wicked, and go not in the way of evil men. Avoid it, pass not by it, turn from it and pass away." "For the lips of a strange woman drop as an honeycomb, and her mouth is smoother than oil: but her end is bitter as wormwood, sharp as a two-edged sword. Her feet go down to death; her steps take hold on hell. . . . Remove thy way far from her, and come not nigh the door of her house: lest thou give thine honour unto others, and thy years unto the cruel: lest strangers be filled with thy wealth; and thy labours be in the house of a stranger; and thou mourn at the last, when thy flesh and thy body are consumed, and say, How have I hated instruction, and my heart despised reproof; and have not obeyed the voice of my teachers, nor inclined mine ear to them that instructed me!" "Let not thine heart decline to her ways, go not astray in her paths. For she hath cast down many wounded: yea, many strong men have been slain by her. Her house is the way to hell, going down to the chambers of death" (Prov. iv. 14, 15; v. 3—13; vii. 25—27). 2. Positive. Seek those things which will give health and strength to the soul. "Happy is the man that findeth wisdom, and the man that getteth understanding. For the merchandise of it is better than the merchandise of silver, and the gain thereof than fine gold. She is more precious than rubies: and all the things thou canst desire are not to be compared unto her. Length of days is in her right hand; and in her left hand riches and honour. Her ways are ways of pleasantness, and all her paths are peace. She is a tree of life to them that lay hold upon her: and happy is every one that retaineth her" (Prov. iii. 13—18).

Vers. 45, 46.—*The extrusion of the leper from the camp is a type of excommunication from the Christian Church.* The right of separating from the community such as will not submit to discipline belongs to all bodies secular and ecclesiastical. Civil societies exercise this right by inflicting the penalties of death, imprisonment, or exile; the Church's penalty is suspension of communion, or excommunication. (For an account of Jewish and Christian excommunication, as founded on scriptural authority, see article in Smith's 'Dictionary of the Bible,' vol. iii. appendix.)

The purpose of the exclusion of the leper was to prevent legal uncleanness being spread by his means: the purpose of the excommunication of the sinner is twofold—partly for his own benefit, partly for that of the community. The power of admitting

into the Church and excluding from it by the use of the proper means was promised to St. Peter (Matt. xvi. 19), and given to all the apostles (Matt. xviii. 15—18; John xx. 23). The power of admission was exercised every time that baptism was administered, that of exclusion was exercised by St. Paul in the case of the incestuous Corinthian (1 Cor. v. 3—5), and in the case of Hymenæus and Alexander (1 Tim. i. 20). St. Paul incidentally states that the purpose of their excommunication was (1) “to deliver such an one unto Satan, for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus;” and (2) “to purge out the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump” (1 Cor. v. 5, 6). So far as the effect on others is concerned, the severance of the leper has an analogous object with that of the severance of the sinner; but the effect of the Church’s discipline on the soul of the sinner ought to have a result which the penalty inflicted on the leper could not bring about. What this result should be is shown in the case of the incestuous Corinthian. The reproof was stern and the punishment sharp, but it produced repentance, and then the continuance of the infliction of the penalty ceased. “Sufficient to such a man is this punishment, which was inflicted of many. So that contrariwise ye ought rather to forgive him, and comfort him, lest perhaps such a one should be swallowed up with overmuch sorrow. Wherefore I beseech you that ye would confirm your love toward him” (2 Cor. ii. 6—8). Church discipline is a condition of the well-being of the Church, and it must be put in practice in the case of both immorality (1 Cor. v.) and heresy (1 Tim. i. 20), but no Church discipline can have good results which has not for its first object the good of the sinner, and which is not exercised in the spirit of love. There have been periods in the history of the Church when a sincere desire to prevent contamination by supposed heterodox teaching has wrought far more harm than could have been produced by any amount of liberty or licence, whether of thought, or speech, or act.

#### HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

*The diagnosis of sin as illustrated in the leprosy.* Ch. xiii.; cf. 2 Kings v.; Ps. lxxxviii.; Matt. viii. 1—4; Luke v. 12—15. The preceding chapter brings forward sin as an inheritance through ordinary generation. No thorough sense or treatment of sin can be reached unless it is recognized as a *nature*. But God went further in his education of his people. He took one disease with unmistakable characteristics; he legislated about it, doomed the possessor of it to a certain treatment, and so made plain to all his attitude towards sin.

The case of Naaman (2 Kings v.) demonstrates that leprosy was not treated in Syria as it was among the Jews. Though a leper, he could enjoy the society of his family, wait upon his king, and command the army. The disease entailed no penalties at Damascus such as existed in Samaria. No sanitary solution, therefore, of this Mosaic law will satisfy the conditions; we must look to moral and spiritual considerations for the solution.<sup>1</sup> Hence we are constrained to start with the canon of interpretation that leprosy was a disease selected for treatment among the Jews to illustrate the treatment of sin.

**L AS SOON AS THE DISEASE IS SUSPECTED, THE PERSON IS TO GO, OR BE BROUGHT, NOT TO A PHYSICIAN, BUT TO ONE OF THE PRIESTS.** This took it out of the category of diseases curable by ordinary means. Hence the term for “leprosy” (*νύμη*, from *νύμεν*, to strike down) signifies “the stroke of God.” It was deemed a Divine infliction, which, if not divinely cured, would terminate fatally, and, though not disseminated by contact, was transmissible from parent to child. In handing it over in such circumstances for religious treatment, there was afforded one of the most striking illustrations of the nature of sin. Sin is a disease which none but the Divine Physician can cure. All effort at self-cure, all effort after merely human cure, is unavailing. Of course, sinners are induced to believe in the curability of the incurable, else there would be no sale for many a “patent medicine,” and no opening for many a spiritual imposture. But God has made it sufficiently plain, by statement and illustration, that sin is a

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Trench ‘On the Miracles,’ the chapter on ‘The Cleansing of the Leper.’

disease with which only he himself can deal. Hence he handed its symbol, the leprosy, to a priest, and not to a physician.

II. THE PRIEST, IN INVESTIGATING THE DISEASE, IS TO ASCERTAIN WHETHER IT IS SUPERFICIAL OR VITAL. It may be only a "scab" or a "burning boil," a mere superficial eruption, in which case the priest is to comfort the patient with the assurance that he is clean. But if the disease is seen to go down into the vitals of the patient, to be deep and hidden, then the priest is to pronounce him unclean.

For sin is no superficial matter, but a vital and fatal evil. It eats below the appearances into the very vitals of the being, and, unless divinely checked, must run its fatal course.

III. THE PENALTY OF PRONOUNCED LEPROSY IS A LIVING DEATH, AND A CONSEQUENT EXCLUSION FROM THE CAMP OF GOD. "The leper in whom the plague is, his clothes shall be rent, and his head bare, and he shall put a covering upon his upper lip, and shall cry, Unclean, unclean. All the days wherein the plague shall be in him he shall be defiled; he is unclean: he shall dwell alone; without the camp shall his habitation be" (vers. 45, 46). It is instructive to analyze this sentence. And—

1. *The leper was to regard himself as virtually a dead man.* This is implied by the rent clothes and the bare head, the signs of Oriental mourning. He was to be his own chief mourner. The same idea was carried out in the Middle Ages, when the mass for the dead was said over the leper. Longfellow refers to this in his 'Golden Legend,' when he says of Prince Henry—

"Why, in Saint Rochus  
They made him stand, and wait his doom;  
And, as if he were condemned to the tomb,  
Began to mutter their hocus-pocus.  
First, the mass for the dead they chaunted,  
Then three times laid upon his head  
A shovelful of churchyard clay,  
Saying to him, as he stood undaunted,  
'This is a sign that thou art dead;  
So in thy heart be penitent!'  
And forth from the chapel door he wen'  
Into disgrace and banishment,  
Clothed in a cloak of hoden gray,  
And bearing a wallet, and a bell,  
Whose sound should be a perpetual knell  
To keep all travellers away."

In the leper we have, therefore, the finest possible illustration of what spiritual death is. It is not a state of unconsciousness, but a state of consciousness. A sense of hopeless doom goes to make up this living death. Here have we vividly presented what "dead in trespasses and sins" must mean. 2. *The leper was to cry out as he met a passenger, "Unclean, unclean!"* That is, he was to encourage the consciousness of personal uncleanness. In no way could a penitent spirit be more powerfully illustrated. A perpetual humiliation was thus kept up, a sense of vileness and uncleanness, which is wholesome for the soul. Doubtless the sense of uncleanness might be impenitent; the poor leper might regard himself as a victim of providence instead of one deserving the stroke. But his cry is a very vivid representation of what humiliation for sin should be. 3. *The leper must isolate himself from the society of the pure, and dwell without the camp.* Isolation is what the leper is required to enter, and what we may be sure he does enter willingly. To a doomed man like him, contact with the clean and pure would be painful. Isolation would be easier to bear than society. So is it with sin. It is an isolating, repellent power. The sinner would not choose the society of the holy. Heaven would be a more painful place for a sinful soul than Gehenna itself. Hence we find in Rev. xxi. that while the new Jerusalem is to have nothing that defileth within it, no precaution to ensure this is needed; the gates remain open, for sinners would not, even if they could, court the society of the holy.

The isolating power of sin may be illustrated from the case of Byron. Two quotations are worth giving in this connection.

"I loved—but those I loved are gone;  
 Had friends—my early friends are fled.  
 How cheerless feels the heart alone,  
 When all its former hopes are dead!  
 Though gay companions o'er the bowl  
 Dispel awhile the sense of ill;  
 Though pleasure stirs the maddening soul,  
 The heart—the heart—is lonely still."

And again in the stanzas written at Missolonghi, when he was thirty-six—

"My days are in the yellow leaf;  
 The flowers and fruits of love are gone;  
 The worm, the canker, and the grief  
 Are mine alone!  
 "The fire that on my bosom preys  
 Is lone as some volcanic isle;  
 No torch is kindled at its blaze—  
 A funeral pile."

Was it not to taste the full consequences of human sin that our Lord had to enter the desolation which constrained the cry on the cross, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"

IV. ON THE OTHER HAND, THE PRIEST IS DIRECTED HOW HE MAY ASCERTAIN WHEN THE LEPROSY HAS BEEN CURED. For this direction contemplates cases of cure, where "the stroke of God" in the leprosy has been followed up by the mercy of God in removing it. Now, one general principle runs through the cases of cure. If the priest has evidence that the disease has *all come to the surface*, then he is to pronounce the leper clean. The spiritual counterpart of this is not far to seek. If sin be hidden, if the sinner, like the Psalmist, keep silence about it, then his bones wax old through his roaring all the day long, and his moisture is turned into the drought of summer (Ps. xxxii. 3, 4). But if the sinner confesses his sin, acknowledges all he knows, and that there is much besides known only to the Lord—in a word, if the sinner makes "a clean breast" of everything, then is the cure of God in process of accomplishment. The lesson here is consequently the great desirability of a full and heartfelt confession of sin. There is hope of a man when he hides nothing from the Lord.

V. MAN SHOULD BE AS CAREFUL ABOUT HIS ENVIRONMENT AS ABOUT HIMSELF. It is evident from the possibility of leprosy infecting garments, and even houses, that the disease was contemplated as having a much wider range than the person of the leper. The directions given to the priest, moreover, contemplate the purification of man's surroundings. Every effort is to be made to stamp out the plague. The pure or purified are to be surrounded by the pure,

Now, this conveys the spiritual lesson surely of man taking the utmost pains to have a pure atmosphere, so to speak, in which to cultivate purity of life. Wherever sin is allowed free play, it will extend its ravages to man's environment. The world itself is a different world through man's sin. The duty of God's people in this case is plain. "The very appearance of evil" must be avoided (1 Thess. v. 22). We must carefully keep ourselves unspotted from the world (Jas. i. 27). Whenever we find sin tempting us, we must, if possible, have it removed and consumed. Does it meet us in literature? let us avoid it, and, if possible, destroy it. And even the ravages of sin in the world itself must be contemplated in the hope of having them one day completely removed. Let sin be slain in the light of day is the great practical lesson of this chapter.—R. M. E.

Vers. 1-59.—*Leprosy.* That leprosy is a type of sin is evident from David's allusion in confessing his own horrible offences (see Ps. li. 7). This also appears from the words of Jesus to the only leper, out of the ten cleansed by him, who returned to give glory to God: "Thy faith hath saved *thee*" (see Luke xvii. 11-19). The others had faith which availed them to remove the leprosy of the body; but this man's faith availed to remove the leprosy of the soul. Hence this plague often came as a judgment

from Heaven upon sin (see Numb. xii. 10; 2 Kings v. 27; 2 Chron. xxvi. 19), from which circumstance, perhaps, it had its name (*רָאַת*), *tsaraath*, from (*רָאַת*), *tsaro*, to smite. As there is no disease whose description engages so much space in Scripture, leprosy must be regarded as a very special type of sin.

I. IT IS A PLAGUE MOST LOATHSOME. 1. *So it is described.* (1) According to Scripture it appeared in a “rising,” or “scab,” or “bright spot” (ver. 2). From one or more of these centres it “spread” (vers. 8, 12, 22, 36), exhibiting “quick raw flesh” (vers. 10, 15), and this as it dried turned to a white scurf (ver. 13). Job is, by some, supposed to have been afflicted with leprosy (see Job vii, 5). (2) Travellers give frightful accounts of it. Maundrell describes it as he witnessed it in Palestine, and states it to be “the utmost corruption of the human body at this side the grave.” 2. *Is not this a true picture of sin?* (1) View it in the haunts of the “criminal classes.” What spectacles are witnessed in police courts! what distortion of features, what mutilations, the humanity almost battered out of them through the violences of dissipation! (2) No less loathsome to the eye of God are the hearts of many who outwardly seem respectable (Jer. xvii. 9). Sin is called “corruption,” and seducers to sin “corrupters” (Eph. iv. 22; 2 Pet. ii. 19). Learn to loathe sin.

II. IT IS A DISEASE DEEPLY SEATED. 1. *Surface evils may be mistaken for sin.* (1) When symptoms go no deeper than the skin, they are no proof of leprosy (vers. 4, 34). Errors of judgment sometimes are mistaken for sins. Sincere Christians should be careful not to condemn themselves when God does not condemn them. (2) Surface evils may be very painful. There were “burning boils,” which did not compromise the cleanliness of the sufferer (vers. 23, 28). So may we smart under reproaches and scandals raised by the malignity of enemies, and perhaps sometimes through our own unwise, which God will not impute to us for sin. 2. *When the evil is in the flesh there is uncleanness.* (1) This was a capital test of leprosy (vers. 3, 20, 30). This disease may be handed down from father to son (see 2 Kings v. 27). So sin is “that which cometh out of the heart” (Matt. xv. 18—20; 1 Cor. viii. 7; Titus i. 15; Heb. xii. 15, 16). Like its type, sin also is hereditary (Rom. v. 12). (2) Mental rebellion against God is of the worst kind. Hence the emphasis with which the uncleanness of the leper is pronounced whose leprosy is in his *head* (see vers. 43, 44). Satan is intellect without God. Keep a pure faith and it will keep you.

III. IT IS A MALADY FEARFULLY CONTAGIOUS. 1. *Such was the figure.* (1) Leprosy works secretly at first, and for years may be concealed. Its early appearance may be limited to a pimple; but so rapidly does it spread that “seven days” may be sufficient for it to become pronounced (vers. 22, 27, 36). (2) It may pass from the leper to his neighbour. Robinson says, “That it was contagious, all histories, sacred and profane, agree” (“Theological Dictionary”). It was therefore necessary to provide that lepers should dwell apart (ver. 46; Numb. xii. 15; 2 Chron. xxvii. 21). (3) Property as well as persons caught the plague. Garments had to be destroyed for it (ver. 52). Houses also (ch. xiv. 45). 2. *The reality answers to the figure.* (1) Sin in the individual gathers strength by habit, and infects the faculties until the heart is sick, the head faint, and the whole man is a mass of moral putrescence (Isa. i. 6). (2) By precept and example he demoralizes his neighbours, and brings down the judgments of Heaven upon them (Josh. vii. 1, 11, 12; Eccles. ix. 18). (3) The plague of sin affects the material prosperity of individuals and of nations. No wonder the leper should be accounted ceremonially unclean, and the sinner avoided by the holy universe.—J. A. M.

Vers. 1—59.—*The priest's adjudication.* We have considered the plague of leprosy as an emblem of sin; the adjudication upon it will suggest thoughts concerning the treatment of sin. In this business the principal actor was the priest, who must be viewed as the type of Christ. The judgment in this case will be disciplinary rather than final; for when Messiah will come to judge the world at the last day, he will appear not as a priest but as a king. We are now concerned with the functions of the priest.

I. HE HAD TO EXAMINE THE SUSPECTED PERSON. 1. *In this he proceeded according to the Law.* (1) He had his rules for determining the presence of the plague. (2) So by the Word of God is our moral cleanliness or uncleanness to be determined (Rom. ii. 18; iii. 20; 1 Cor. xiv, 24, 25; Jas. i. 22—25; ii. 9). (3) Conviction is carried

home by the Spirit of Christ. 2. *When the case was dubious judgment was deferred.* (1) Meanwhile the suspected person was "shut up" (vers. 4, 21, 31) that opportunity might be given for the manifestation of the symptoms. So are sinners "shut up" by the Law to the faith of the gospel (see Rom. xi. 32, margin; Gal. iii. 23). (2) At the end of "seven days" judgment was given; or, if the symptoms were not then sufficiently manifest, a second period of seven days was allowed, which was the final term. Could these periods refer to the dispensations of our probation? In this case the leper must be taken to personate a class of sinner according to the type of his disease, whether proceeding from the "rising," or the "boil," or the "scab." In any case, a sufficient probation is given us in this world for the manifestation of our real character, which probation we should be careful to improve. 3. *A leprous garment was treated as representing its owner.* (1) It had to be inspected by the priest for his judgment and sentence, as though it had been a person. In case the plague in it were not pronounced, it had to be "shut up" and examined again after the same intervals of "seven days" (vers. 50, 54). The expense and trouble of this, particularly if it had to be brought from a distance, would be as much as the garment was worth, so that the Law is unaccountable unless it was intended to serve a typical purpose. (2) Agabus the prophet made Paul's girdle emblematically to represent that apostle (Acts xxi. 11). The "owner" of a leprous house, obviously for the same reason, had to "come and tell the priest" (ch. xiv. 35). (3) The washing of the garment in this case suggests the washing of regeneration.

II. **HE HAD TO PRONOUNCE UPON HIM.** 1. *In some cases the verdict was an acquittal.* (1) If the suspected leprosy proved to be but a surface evil, the subject was pronounced clean (ver. 6). Jesus does not mark as sins infirmities which spring not from an evil *nature*. The person acquitted, however, had to wash his clothes (ver. 34). There is no person so faultless as not to need the laver of regeneration. (2) If a leper be "white all over," no proud flesh, no ichor, being visible, he is pronounced clean (ver. 18). The virulence of the disease is over; God's mercy has reached him; the sinner is forgiven. But the marks of an old dissipation often remain after forgiveness. Though now clean, there can be no question that he had been a leper. (3) Another case is given. A leper, supposing his disease gone, presents himself to the priest for his cleansing; but the priest, discovering "raw flesh," sends him away unclean; in time, however, he becomes cured, returns to the priest, and on the second application is pronounced clean (ver. 17). This case is like that of the sinner whose repentance is not perfect, and at the altar he discovers that until he is reconciled to a brother whom he had wronged his gift cannot be accepted; the reconciliation made, he returns and finds the favour of God (Matt. v. 23, 24). 2. *In other cases the judgment was "Unclean."* (1) When the plague is pronounced, as in cases of "old leprosy," deliberation was unnecessary; judgment came speedily (vers. 10, 11). So with the openly wicked (Ps. ix. 16; Prov. v. 22; xi. 5). (2) In all cases evidence must be clear. Time, therefore, was given for the plague to pronounce itself. So, before judgment could overtake the Amorites, their iniquity must be full (Gen. xv. 16; see also Dan. viii. 23; Matt. xxiii. 32, 33; 1 Thess. ii. 16). (3) Jesus is unerring in his judgments. He is the faithful as well as merciful High Priest. 3. *The sentence.* (1) The leper has to dwell without the camp (ver. 16). So must the open sinner be put out of the Church (see 1 Cor. v. 11-13). Hypocrites and unbelievers, though in the Church in the visible part, are not recognized by God as members of the Church in the spiritual part. (2) The leper has to behave as an excommunicate seeking for the mercy of God. His clothes are rent to express extreme grief and sorrow. His head is bare, turbanless, to express deep humiliation. He put a covering upon his upper lip; had his jaw tied up with a linen cloth as a corpse, to express his state as that of a living death (see 2 Kings v. 7; Ezek. xxiv. 17), and he was to cry "Unclean!" (ver. 45). When we confess that we are dead in trespasses and sins, and sorrow to repentance, there is hope for us in God. (3) But as the garment that remains unclean after two washings, to save it from destruction must have the leprous piece rent from it; so if a "right hand" or "right eye" prevent us from realizing the benefits of redemption, they must be separated (ver. 56). But if all efforts to save the garment fail, then its doom is to be burnt (see Matt. v. 29, 30; xviii. 8, 9).—J. A. M.

**Vers. 45, 46.—A picture of sin.** The stringent rules for the treatment of the leper

are not sufficiently explained by sanitary considerations. The Jews saw in the leper a symbol of the sinner visited with the displeasure of God. His was a stroke of smiting ("plague of leprosy") from the hand of Jehovah, which made him "utterly unclean" (ver. 44). The instructions of this chapter may convey to us important truth respecting the sinner's condition. To behold it thus forcibly depicted may administer a wholesome warning.

I. THE CORRUPTION EFFECTED BY SIN. Cannot but shudder at: 1. Its *loathsome*ness, destroying man's appearance, making him offensive to the sight. How abominable is wickedness to the pure eyes of God, and if our moral sense were keener, what constant shocks should we receive from the wicked conduct of men! What want of taste to indulge in sin! what disharmony of relationship it introduces! 2. Note its *tendency to spread* until it becomes total. The commission of one crime often leads to another which still more impairs the soul; the inordinate gratification of appetite in one direction is provocative of intemperance in another; to lose modesty is often to lose natural affection. At last the whole constitution betrays the effects of sin, body, mind, and spirit are alike unpleasant to contemplate. 3. Its *destruction of vital power*. It was termed by the Jews a "living death." Of its worst form, where the limbs mortify and drop off, no special mention is made in the Law; indeed, the supposition is that, after the expiration of a certain time, the disease will have so spread as to become harmless, and the man may be termed "clean" (ver. 17). The disease appears to have become more malignant in subsequent ages, and thus to typify even more accurately the waste of strength produced by evil habits. The mental and moral faculties are enervated by sin, the sinner is led captive by the devil at his will. To understand a principle we must push its application to extreme consequences, and if we would entertain fitting conceptions of sin we must regard it not when most refined, not when in its commencement, but in its gross final results. To dread fire, think of the conflagration that visits a town with disorder and ruin!

II. THE EXCLUSION IT ENTAILS FROM HOLY PRIVILEGES. The leper was separated from the people and the sanctuary. 1. *Contact with the sinner defiles*, except in appointed cases, where the servant of God in fulfilment of duty (as the priest in examination) seeks out the moral leper. If men mingle with sinners, having Christ's end in view, to do them good, the association is pardoned. Otherwise "one sinner destroyeth much good," "evil communications corrupt good manners." Men should naturally shun the company of the debased as they would the presence of those afflicted with an infectious disease. 2. *The semblance of sin must be guarded against*. All that appears like it (vers. 5, 6) needs suspicious treatment. Better to err on the safe side, not pronouncing at first decidedly, but watching the operation of a plan, or society, or principle, and ere long its true character will be manifested by development. 3. *Continuance in sin means separation from the Church and the fellowship of right-minded people*. The leper must "dwell alone, without the camp." Our Lord and his apostles insisted on the maintenance of discipline in Christian bodies. The persistent sinner will find himself eventually cut off from intercourse with his former friends, for ungodliness is an effectual barrier, creating uncongeniality of sentiment and behaviour. 4. *Dismission from the presence of God is the worst penalty of sin*. The Psalmist might lament his enforced absence from the tabernacle where he had seen the power and glory of God; but how much more the man who was so near the hill of Zion, and yet so far off by reason of symbolical impurity! Sin kept God and man asunder, and to remove it came the Lord Jesus Christ. The awful sentence finally pronounced upon the unrighteous is "Depart from me!" What absence of joy and peace and love is contained in the words, "the outer darkness"!

III. THE EXPRESSIONS OF FEELING THAT BEFIT THE SINNER'S STATE. 1. *Grief*. The leper wore the garb of mourning. There needs the godly sorrow that worketh repentance. Reflect not simply upon the sad consequences of sin, estrangement from God, deprivation of his favour, but upon their source, and learn to hate sin as an abomination. 2. *Humiliation*. The uncovered head attested the leper's shame. "I abhor myself" is fitting language for polluted lips. 3. *Acknowledgment of guilt*. Listen to the cry, "Unclean!" The upper lip was shrouded in a covering that enjoined general silence, except on the approach of a stranger, who might be thereby defiled. "We are all as an unclean thing." When sin lies heavily upon the conscience,

it is felt to be no time for ordinary conversation, much less for frivolous gossip, though under such a veil anxiety is often hid.

**CONCLUSION.** By the Law was the knowledge of sin, but by the gospel is proclaimed its remedy, forgiveness and sanctification through Christ. The priest was not dependent upon his own judgment, but was guided by fixed rules in deciding upon leprous cases. Yet he did not heal; the sufferer was left to nature's care, and to indulge the vague hope of recovery. The gospel bids all sinners lay aside their fears and rejoice in a panacea that never fails. The interposition of God by prophets which resulted in miraculous cures of leprosy prepared the way for the marvellous works of the Redeemer, who evinced by his restoring the body to health his power also to heal the soul. Thus what was faintly foreshadowed under the old dispensation has been brightly revealed in the new. The enumeration of the feelings appropriate to the sinner is incomplete, therefore, without adding to them hope, in the sense not of wishful longing, but of certain anticipation of salvation.—S. R. A.

Ver. 3.—“It is a plague of leprosy.” *The chosen type of sin—its individual aspect.* The conjecture that leprosy was contracted by the children of Israel in the hot and dusty brick-fields of Egypt is probable enough. The definition that it was “any severe disease spreading on the surface of the body in the way described in the chapter, and so shocking of aspect . . . that public feeling called for separation,” is near enough for our purpose. There can be no question that it was the divinely chosen type of sin.

All disease is pictorial of sin. It is to our bodily frame the very thing that sin is to our soul. Sin is the *derangement or disorder of the soul*, as sickness is of the body. It is an inward disorder, showing itself in some outward manifestation of a displeasing or painful character. It is something wrong within—some faculty (organ) not doing what it was made to do, or doing what it was not meant to do, causing disturbance and distress. But leprosy was selected by the Divine Ruler of Israel as a disease which should be regarded by his people as specially typical and suggestive of sin. It was admirably fitted so to be, whether looked at in its individual or in its social aspect. We will take the former first.

**I. THE OBSCURITY OF ITS ORIGIN.** By what sad and strange process came it to pass that man's bodily frame—fashioned by the Divine Creator, made clean and pure, wholesome and fair—has become the seat of such a foul disorder? How can it be that the little child whose flesh is beautiful and spotless, the very picture of all that is clean and sweet, grows up into a man who is “full of leprosy,” covered from head to foot with revolting sores? And whence came sin into the soul and life of man? How came it here to blot and mar God's fair creation? How comes it to pass that into the heart of the innocent and lovely child there enters the very vilest spirit, showing itself in the most shocking words and the most revolting deeds, in later life?

**II. ITS STUBBORNNESS.** When, after seven days, the Hebrew priest could see no signs of true leprosy, he did not pronounce the patient clean: he shut him up other seven days (ver. 5), and examined him again. Leprosy was a tenacious and stubborn disease, disappearing and reappearing. After a long interval it might, under exciting cause, come once again to the surface. How like the affliction of the soul—sin! How tenacious is its hold on the human heart! It disappears and we are grateful, congratulatory, triumphant. But the inducing circumstances, the favourable conditions arise and conspire, and behold there is its hateful face again. We “would do good,” we resolve to do good, but, alas! “evil is present with us” once more (Rom. vii. 21).

**III. ITS DEATHFULNESS.** The outward appearance was due to inward derangement; the springs of health were poisoned; the internal processes necessary to health were stayed; and the consequence was that feature after feature, limb after limb, decayed and fell away. The man was in a constant process of dissolution. It was death above the ground—death in a living form! Sin is death. The soul that lives in sin is “dead while it lives.” It is not that which it was created to be, *does* not that which it was created to do. Its spiritual faculties (the organs and members of the soul) are in a state of continual dissolution, becoming feebler and feebler, till they are wholly lost. It is a living death.

**IV. ITS INCURABLENESS BY MAN.** The Jews did not bring the physician to the leper;

they regarded leprosy as a visitation from God, and considered it incurable by human art. Sin is incurable by mere human methods. Rules for the regulation of human conduct; pledges or vows of abstinence from particular temptations; parental, magisterial, social vigilance; penalties inflicted by ourself or by others for disobedience;—these are well enough in their way. They are sometimes desirable, sometimes necessary; *but they do not cure*. Nothing human will cure the soul's disorder; only the Almighty Hand can minister to the "mind diseased."

When Jesus Christ would prove to John that he was indeed the "One that should come," and that there was no need to "look for another," he added to the recital of his benefactions, "the lepers are cleansed" (Matt. xi. 5). It was a true mark of the Messiah. The coming Saviour was he who had power to cure the incurable, to touch the foulest of the soul with the finger of the Divine mercy and sovereign power, and to make even him whole and pure. To that Divine Physician the man fullest of the leprosy of sin may go and say, "Lord, if thou wilt thou canst make me clean" (Luke v. 12).—C.

Ver. 5.—*The chosen type of sin—its social aspect.* We have seen (*vide* previous Homily) how true a picture is leprosy of sin in its individual aspect; we now regard the subject in its more social aspect. What this terrible disease was to a man as a member of the Hebrew commonwealth, that is sin to a man as a member of society to-day.

I. **ITS LOATHSOMENESS.** It is quite possible that the leprosy from which the Israelites suffered was a contagious disorder. It is also possible that the dread of contagion, though there was no actual danger (as in cholera), may have had its influence in the matter. But there is no convincing evidence that it was contagious. There are indications that it was not (action of the priests, etc.); and the exclusion of the leper from the camp is fully accounted for in another way. The loathsomeness of the disease is a sufficient explanation. Whoever has seen any one suffering acutely from a kindred malady will perfectly understand and appreciate this legislation on that ground alone. It is difficult, if not impossible, to recover altogether from the mental effect of so shocking and so repulsive a spectacle. The vision haunts the memory for years. In this aspect leprosy is a striking picture of sin; for that is a thing odious and abominable in the last degree—loathsome to the Holy One of Israel, hateful to all holy souls. In its viler forms it is a thing which we—even with our imperfect purity—cannot "look upon" (Hab. i. 13); how much more horrible and hateful must it be in his sight whose thoughts of holiness as well as of mercy are as much higher than ours as the heavens are higher than the earth (Isa. lv. 9)!

II. **ITS DIFFUSIVENESS.** Though not, probably, contagious, leprosy was diffusive and communicable from parent to child. It was one of the crucial tests in the case that *it spread* over the skin (vers. 7, 8), that it "spread much abroad" (vers. 22, 27). As this typical disease spread from one part of the body to another, from one limb and organ to another, until it sometimes covered the entire frame, so sin, of which it was the divinely chosen type, is *a thing that spreads*. It is an emphatically diffusive, a communicable thing. It spreads: 1. From faculty to faculty of the same human spirit; one sin leads on to another, as theft to violence, or drunkenness to falsehood, or impurity to deception. 2. From parent to child. 3. From man to man, through the whole "body politic." It spreads much abroad through any and every body, civil or ecclesiastical, into which it enters.

III. **ITS SEPARATING EFFECT.** "He shall dwell alone: without the camp shall his habitation be" (ver. 46). Leprosy separated between husband and wife, parent and children, friend and friend; it sundered one human life from that of the commonwealth, and was a source of sad and, so far as the preciousness of life was concerned, a fatal loneliness. Sin is the separating power. 1. It comes between man and God (Isa. lix. 2). It places him outside the gates of the spiritual kingdom; it deprives a man of all fellowship with the heavenly Father; it leads him out into a "far country" of alienation, of dread, of dissimilarity. 2. It comes between man and man. It is the endless and bitter source of estrangement, animosity, war; it makes lonely the life that should be full of sweet and elevating fellowship.

IV. **ITS PITIFULNESS.** Who could see the poor leper, with rent clothes, with bare

head, with covered lip, passing through the camp, crying, "Unclean, unclean!" on his way to a dreary and, it might be, life-long solitude and not be affected with a tender pity? He might be "unclean," but he was miserable, he was lost; the light of his life had gone out. Sin is not more condemnable than it is pitiable. Blame the erring, reproach the faulty, remonstrate with the foolish and the mischievous (1 Tim. v. 20), but pity those whom sin is shutting out from all that is best below, and will exclude from all that is bright and blessed above. Remember the "great love (of pity) where-with he loved us, even when we were dead in sins" (Eph. ii. 4, 5), and pity with a profound compassion and help with an uplifting hand those who are still down in the mire of sin, still far from the kingdom of God.—C.

Ver. 3.—*Conviction of sin.* "And the priest shall look on him, and pronounce him unclean." In the Hebrew commonwealth: 1. There were those who were reasonably suspected of leprosy, i.e. of "uncleanness." 2. It was a matter of the gravest consequence to know whether these suspicions were well founded or not. For ascertained leprosy meant unfitness to approach God in worship, exclusion from the fellowship of his people, etc. 3. It was the function of the priest to decide positively in the matter. The priest was to "look on him, and pronounce him unclean," or, on the other hand, to rule that he was clean (ver. 6).

In every commonwealth to-day, in the whole human world—

I. THERE ARE THOSE REASONABLY SUSPECTED OF SIN. These are not the few exceptions; they are the multitude without exception (Ps. xiv. 23).

II. IT IS A MATTER OF THE GRAVEST CONSEQUENCE TO KNOW WHETHER WE ARE SINFUL OR NOT. For sin means (1) unlikeness to God; (2) separation from God; (3) condemnation by God, both here and hereafter; (4) exclusion from the home of the holy. Hence we must ask—

III. WHO ARE THEY ON WHOM THIS GREAT DECISION IS DEVOLVED. It rests with no human priest to decide on our state before God. Our own heart must condemn us if we are to have that *conviction* of sin which leads to *contrition* for sin and to "repentance and *remission* of sin." 1. God will be our Divine Helper. He helps us to a right conclusion by his informing Word and by his illuminating Spirit. 2. Our fellow-men will be human helpers; they will guide us to an understanding of the Word of the Lord, and, directed by their own experience, will lead us to judge truly concerning our spiritual condition. Their aid will be ministerial, not authoritative. 3. We ourselves must decide in the last resort. This is one of those grave matters in which "every man must bear his own burden." We must recognize, with the eyes of our own soul, the signs and tokens of guilt in our heart and life. It must be the deliberate utterance of our own judgment, as well as the sigh of our own spirit, and the cry of our own lips, "I have sinned against the Lord;" "Unclean, unclean!" When we look at our inner selves as well as outer life; when we consider what we have left undone of all our obligations, as well as what we have done that has been forbidden; when we contrast our hearts and lives with the precepts of God's holy Law and the ideal of human perfection in the example of our sinless Saviour; we shall have no hesitation in concluding that we are "utterly unclean," that we deserve exclusion from the friendship of God and the fellowship of the holy, and that it is our heavenly wisdom to seek at once his blessed presence who will say to us, "Wilt thou be made whole?" and to gain at once the touch of his mighty hand who, in answer to our earnest prayer, will respond by saying, "I will; be thou clean."—C.

Vers. 40—44.—*Affections of the mind.* We learn lessons concerning—

I. THE BLEMISH OF MENTAL PECULIARITY. (Ver. 40.) Evidently baldness was an unusual and an unsightly thing among the Israelites. Otherwise it would not have excited notice and could not have created derision (2 Kings ii. 23; Isa. iii. 24; Ezek. vii. 18). It was regarded as an unbecoming peculiarity. Affecting the head, we may regard it as a type of mental peculiarity which does not amount to a serious sin, but is yet unusual and unbecoming. Many men who are substantially sound in heart and life, loving that which is highest and doing that which is just and right, are yet affected and afflicted by mental peculiarities—oddities, crotchets, fancies, awkwardness or crookedness of mental habit; things which are not formidably bad, but which,

because they are superficial, strike the eye, provoke general remark, and stand in the way of effective service. 1. It is right that those who observe them in others should remember that they are *only* blemishes, and nothing more; detracting in some degree from “the beauty of holiness,” but not inconsistent with real and even admirable excellence. “He is bald, yet he is clean” (ver. 40). 2. It is right that those who possess them should reflect, and act on the reflection, that these things, though only blemishes, may importantly diminish the power of the possessor to influence, guide, and win other people. The candle (character) is of much more importance than the candlestick (mental habit), but if character be obscured by some darkening “bushel,” and not put on the candlestick of pleasant and agreeable habits, it will not “give light to all that are in the house” (Matt. v. 15).

II. THE EVIL OF ERROR. There might come on the bald head a spot, a sore; this might be a “white reddish sore”—leprosy (vers. 42, 43). But it might not; it might be nothing but a boil or some cutaneous disorder, which was not leprosy. In that case the patient would be treated as described in vers. 2—6. There would be something wrong, but it was not the unclean thing, leprosy. There is a mental disease which is something more serious than peculiarity and something less serious than guilty perversity. It is error; the arrival at wrong conclusions. There may be but small faultiness in coming to convictions which are not correct, but there may be positive disaster resulting therefrom. A man may innocently take the wrong road, but his innocence will not save him from walking into the bog or over the precipice to which it leads. Error is not the worst thing in the world, but it is a seriously bad and dangerous thing. When we are earnestly warned, by obviously thoughtful and godly men, that we are wrong in our judgments, it becomes us to listen patiently and consider well whether we are in the right track, or whether we have mistaken a false path for the “path of life.”

III. THE SIN OF MENTAL PERVERSITY. (Vers. 43, 44.) There is great significance in the sentence “the priest shall pronounce him utterly unclean.” The man who had leprosy in the head was accounted unclean in an especial degree: he was *utterly* unclean. Sin, of which this malady was so striking a type, never assumes so dangerous a phase as when it appears in the form of a perverted judgment or a darkened conscience. When, by sinning, a man has blunted his spiritual perceptions so that he “calls evil good, and good evil,” he is in the last stage of moral decline; death is near at hand. If “our eye be evil” (if our judgment be perverted, our faculty of spiritual perception be diseased), our “whole body is full of darkness;” if “the light that is in us” (our own mental and spiritual faculty) be darkness, how great is that darkness! (Matt. v. 23). Witness the Pharisees in their treatment of our Lord. We may well be actively on our guard against, and may well be earnest in prayer that God will deliver us from, that of which leprosy in the head is the painful picture,—a guilty, blinding, ruinous perversity of mind.—C.

Ver. 46.—*The right and duty of excommunication.* “He shall dwell alone; without the camp shall his habitation be.” The right of expulsion from the Jewish camp would be founded, in the mind of Moses, on the Divine commandment (text; Numb. v. 2, etc.). That was all-sufficient for the great legislator. We may, however, “justify the ways of God to men” to our mind by the considerations: 1. That if the disease were not positively contagious, the dread of contagion would be most harmful to the community. 2. That the exceeding repulsiveness of the leper was ample reason for his being kept from the sight of men, women, and children. 3. That the most important and salutary lesson concerning sin was thereby vividly enforced, viz. that the sinner is, through his iniquity, separated from all that is purest and best. Unquestionably, with this and other clear commandments from Jehovah, it was both the right and the duty of the Hebrew commonwealth to expel the leper from the camp. Excommunication from human society is a sad and severe measure; but it is, in many cases, lawful and even obligatory. The foul and the “unclean” must be separated sometimes, even now and here, from the holy and the pure. Excommunication may be—

I. THE RIGHT AND DUTY OF THE NATION. 1. The nation has a right to transport or imprison those of its members who have committed crime, and who have shown that their presence “in the camp” is noxious and dangerous to the rest. 2. The nation

is bound to exclude from town and city those who endanger its morals. The opium-seller, *as such*, is righteously excluded; the man who would sell poisons without restriction is disallowed; and an unlimited number of dramshops, with their terrible enticements, is (or, surely, should be) prohibited. A community has the right to say, "We will not allow any man, for the sake of gain, seriously to imperil the morals, the health, and the lives of the people; if you want to practise these things, you must go 'without the camp.'"

II. THE RIGHT AND DUTY OF THE SOCIAL AND THE FAMILY CIRCLE. 1. We ought not to admit to our intimacy any "unclean" human spirit. We should fence our social circles so that no man sits down to our table or our hearth to infect and poison our own minds. 2. But it is, in an especial degree, both our right and our duty, as parents, to guard the *family circle* from the intrusion of "the unclean." What untold evils, what unimaginable sorrows, have beset family life, because parents have not, with holy vigilance, saved their sons and daughters from the companionship of the corrupt! Of every "unclean" soul let the human father say, with sternest inflexibility, "Without the camp shall *his* habitation be."

III. THE RIGHT AND DUTY OF THE CHURCH. There can be no doubt of this. 1. *It is the divinely appointed way.* It was instituted by our Lord himself (Matt. xviii. 17, 18). It was enjoined by the Apostle Paul (1 Cor. v. 2, 5, 11; Titus iii. 10); it was also practised by him (1 Tim. i. 20). 2. *It is the legitimate and becoming method.* Any interference by a Christian Church with civil rights goes beyond the Word of the Lord, brings the Church into conflict with the secular power, and is likely to lead to confusion and trouble. Exclusion from its own fellowship is a natural and incontestable right. 3. *It is sometimes the only course that is open.* It is needful for the purity of the Church itself; the leaven must not injure the whole lump. It is needful also for the offender. And it is well to remember these two things in such a sad necessity: viz. (1) that excommunication was resorted to in apostolic times with a distinct view to the benefit of the offender (1 Cor. v. 5; 1 Tim. i. 20); and (2) that of two cases reported in Scripture, one relates the restoration of the excommunicated member (2 Cor. ii. 6—8). Let the Church make paramount the preservation of its own purity, but let it encourage, expect, and welcome penitence.—C.

#### EXPOSITION.

LEPROSY IN CLOTHES (vers. 47—59). To account for the use of the name leprosy in this connection, an ingenious theory has been propounded that the same cause produced a like effect in the human frame in clothes and in houses. "There is here described a disease whose cause must have been of organic growth, capable of living in the human being and of creating there a foul and painful disease of contagious character, while it could also live and reproduce itself in garments of wool, linen, or skin; nay, more, it could attach itself to the walls of a house and there also effect its own reproduction. Animalcules, always capable of choice, would scarcely be found so transferable, and we are therefore justified in supposing that green or red fungi, so often seen in epidemic periods, were the protean disease of man and his garment and his house" (Dr. Mitchell, 'Five Essays'). It is not necessary to have recourse to this

tempting but unproved hypothesis, inasmuch as the similarity of appearance presented by the two affections is enough to account for their going by the same name. Leprosy in garments and in leather is a mildew which cannot be got rid of, called leprosy by analogy. Like other causes of uncleanness, it makes the material unclean, because it gives a repulsive appearance to it, reminding the beholder of the disease which it resembles. "Leprosy in linen and woollen fabrics or clothes consisted in all probability in nothing but so-called mildew, which commonly arises from damp and want of air, and consists, in the case of linen, of round, partially coloured spots, which spread and gradually eat up the fabric, until it falls to pieces like mould. In leather, the mildew consists more strictly of 'holes eaten in,' and is of a greenish, reddish, or whitish colour, according to the species of the delicate cryptogami by which it has been formed" (Keil).

Ver. 47.—Whether it be a woollen garment, or a linen garment. Wool and flax are the two materials for clothes mentioned in Deut. xxii. 11; Prov. xxxi. 13; Hos. ii. 7.

Ver. 48.—Whether it be in the warp, or woof. It is hardly possible that such a fault as leprosy or mildew could appear in one set of the threads without affecting the others, provided that both were equally good when they were made up into the cloth; but it is quite possible that a heap of yarn, used either for the warp or for the woof, might have been injuriously affected before it was woven, and then the fault would naturally make its appearance where the mischief had been originally done. Whether in a skin, or in anything made of skin. An example of the first would be a sheepskin cloak; the second would designate anything made of leather.

Vers. 49—59.—The priest is to deal with the texture as nearly as may be in the same way that he dealt with the human subject, in order to discriminate between a temporary discolouration and a real leprosy. He shall shut up it that hath the plague *seven days* (ver. 50), may, as before, mean, *He shall bind up the place affected seven days*. If the priest judges that it is leprosy, he is to burn the garment, if not, to tear out the piece affected, whether it be in the warp, or in the woof, that is, in whatever part it appears, and to wash the remainder twice. The expression, whether it be bare within or without, literally, *whether it be bald in the head thereof or in the forehead thereof*, means, “whether the fault appear in the front or in the back of the texture.”

### HOMILETICS.

Vers. 47—59.—*On purity of garments.* There are passages in different parts of Holy Scripture which it is necessary to put together in order to get a comprehensive view of what only at first sight appears to be a slight subject.

I. The first result of the Fall was a consciousness of sin on the part of Adam and Eve, which caused a sense of their nakedness. This nakedness they in vain attempted to cover by aprons of fig leaves (Gen. iii. 7). But their self-made covering was not sufficient; they “were afraid because they were naked, and they hid themselves from the presence of the Lord God amongst the trees of the garden” (Gen. iii. 8, 10). God’s first gift to man after sentence had been passed upon him was that of clothes: “Unto Adam also and to his wife did the Lord God make coats of skins, and clothed them” (Gen. iii. 21). This gift is the more significant in that the Hebrew word used for “atonement” is “covering.” Here, then, in God’s first gift to man was foreshadowed his future gift of an atonement. “The outward and corporeal here manifestly had respect to the inward and spiritual. The covering of the nakedness was a gracious token from the hand of God that the sin which had alienated them from him and made them conscious of uneasiness was henceforth to be in his sight as if it were not; so that in covering their flesh, he at the same time covered their consciences. . . . It was done purposely to denote the covering of guilt from the eye of Heaven—an act which God alone could have done” (Fairbairn, ‘Typology of Scripture’). The more that we consider the force of the Hebrew term for “atonement,” the more significance shall we attach to the first gift of coats. “To expiate, literally, to cover up, does not mean to cause a sin not to have been committed, for that is impossible; nor to represent it as having no existence, for that would be opposed to the earnestness of the Law; nor to pay or compensate it by any performance; but to cover it before God, i.e. to deprive it of its power to come between us and God” (Kahnis).

II. We have seen with what care God appointed “holy garments” for the Jewish priesthood, “for glory and for beauty” (Exod. xxviii. 2, 40; xxxix. 1—43; ch. viii. 7—9), and special instructions are afterwards given as to the dress to be worn by the high priest when he entered the holy of holies (ch. xvi.; cf. Ps. cxxxii. 9).

III. Uncleanness derived from the touch of unclean things entailed washing the clothes worn at the time (ch. xi. 28, 40; xvi. 26).

IV. In Zech. iii. 3—5 we read, “Now Joshua was clothed with filthy garments, and stood before the angel. And he answered and spake unto those that stood before him, saying, Take away the filthy garments from him. And unto him he said, Behold, I have caused thine iniquity to pass from thee, and I will clothe thee with change of raiment. And I said, Let them set a fair mitre upon his head. So they set a fair mitre upon his head, and clothed him with garments. And the angel of the Lord

stood by." Here we are directly taught that filthy garments typify iniquity, and that the removal of filthy garments typifies the passing away of iniquity. Isaiah explains the meaning of the putting on of new garments: "He hath clothed me with the garments of salvation, he hath covered me with the robe of righteousness, as a bridegroom decketh himself with ornaments, and as a bride adorneth herself with her jewels" (Isa. lxi. 10).

From these passages of the Old Testament we find that clothing is connected with the idea of atonement, that God will not be approached except in holy garments, that foul garments typify iniquity, that garments which have contracted ceremonial uncleanness must be washed, that clean garments typify salvation and righteousness.

From the New Testament we learn what are the materials of the robe of salvation. They are the righteousness of Christ imputed to man—such is the argument of the Epistle to the Romans and the Epistle to the Galatians—and the righteousness in-wrought in man by the indwelling of the Holy Ghost—"for the fine linen is the righteousness of saints" (Rev. xix. 8). If these form the materials of the Christian's spiritual raiment, there will appear no leprosy or mildew either in warp or woof. But if in place of one of these there be employed human merit or sanctity or other material, the plague will appear in the garment. "*And the priest shall rend it out of the garment, or out of the skin, or out of the warp, or out of the woof: and if it appear still in the garment, either in the warp, or in the woof, or in anything of skin; it is a spreading plague; thou shalt burn that wherein the plague is with fire.*" But there is this difference between leprosy in the garment and leprosy in the flesh, that in the former case the man may still be saved: "It shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is. . . . If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire" (1 Cor. iii. 13—15). And therefore St. Jude, in special reference to this passage, writes, "And of some have compassion, making a difference: and others save with fear, pulling them out of the fire; hating even the garment spotted by the flesh" (Jude 22, 23). The Christian is to hold in abhorrence "the garment" defiled with a like disease to that which attacks "the flesh," and is to cast it into the fire, but at the same time he is to "pull" the wearer himself "out of the fire," "saving" him "with fear." If the disease be true leprosy, but has not penetrated deeper than the garment, the garment must be burnt, but the wearer may still be "saved; yet so as by fire;" it will be a work of "fear" and anxiety. If it be not true leprosy, and even if it be—for here the antitype transcends the type—it will be possible to "wash his robes and make them white in the blood of the Lamb" (Rev. vii. 14).

Warning—"I counsel thee to buy of me gold tried in the fire, that thou mayest be rich; and white raiment, that thou mayest be clothed, and that the shame of thy nakedness do not appear" (Rev. iii. 18). "Blessed is he that watcheth, and keepeth his garments, lest he walk naked, and they see his shame" (Rev. xvi. 15). "Friend, how camest thou in hither not having a wedding garment? And he was speechless" (Matt. xxii. 12).

#### HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

Vers. 47—59.—*Impure surroundings.* Our garments are our immediate surroundings, and there may be in them as well as in ourselves that which is offensive and "unclean." There was an impurity in the garment as well as in the human body against which the Law provided. The classing of clothes and houses with the human skin as leprous, "has moved the mirth of some and the wonder of others . . . but the analogy between the insect which frets the human skin and that which frets the garment that covers it, between the fungous growth that lines the crevices of the epidermis and that which creeps in the interstices of masonry, is close enough for the purposes of ceremonial law." The legal provision here made for the leprous garment suggests to us—

I. THE IMPURE SURROUNDINGS BY WHICH WE MAY BE ENVIRONED. These are many: 1. Depraved tastes and cravings in our body (for the body is the *immediate* clothing of the spirit). 2. Unholy companionships. 3. Corrupt political associations. 4. Impure,

demoralizing books (or any form of hurtful literature). 5. Injurious occupation—that which wounds the conscience or enfeebles the inner life. 6. A deadening Church—a religious society where the form without the power of godliness is left.

II. THE DIVINELY SUGGESTED TREATMENT OF THEM. We gather from these verses that we should: 1. *Exercise vigilance in detecting.* With the same carefulness with which the priest made himself sure in the matter of the leprous garment (vers. 50—57), we must make certain whether there be in any of our surroundings—or of those for whom we are responsible—the plague which will work spiritual mischief in the heart and ultimate ruin to the character. 2. *Make serious effort to cleanse.* If, after seven days, there had been no spreading of the plague, the priest was to *wash* the garment (ver. 54), and if the plague departed, it was to be washed a second time, and then it was clean (ver. 58). All that was salvable was to be saved. If by vigorous and repeated washing any spotted garment could be preserved, it was not to be destroyed. All that is reformable in our institutions and surroundings must be reformed. We must cleanse where we can make pure and where it is unnecessary to destroy. But sometimes we must: 3. *Unscrupulously destroy.* When unmistakable signs of leprosy appeared, the priest was to “burn that garment;” it was to “be burnt in the fire” (ver. 52). When we find in anything that surrounds us and that is exerting an influence upon us, that which is really hurtful to us—that which would lead us astray from God, we must sacrifice it altogether, at whatever cost (see Mark ix. 43—47). Our belongings must be put into the fire rather than be permitted to stain our soul.—C.

### EXPOSITION.

#### CHAPTER XIV.

THE FORM OF PURIFICATION OF THE LEPER (ch. xiv. 1—32). This is the most minute of all the forms of purification, those for purification from contact with a dead body (Numb. xix.) and for the cleansing of a defiled Nazarite (Numb. vi.) being alone to be compared with it in this respect. Some purifications were accomplished, as we have seen, in a very summary manner: one who touched the carcase of a beast that had died a natural death had only to wash his clothes (ch. xi. 40). The greater and more significative the defilement, the more careful and the more significative must be the cleansing. Leprous uncleanness excluded the leper both from the camp and from the sanctuary, from the rights both of citizenship and of Church-membership, with which the rights of the family were also associated; consequently there had to be a double form of restoration, each with its special ceremonies. The manner of the first reconciliation is detailed in ver. 1—8, of the second in ver. 9—32.

Ver. 2.—*This shall be the law of the leper in the day of his cleansing.* The ceremonies in the first stage of cleansing, which restored the outcast to the common life of his fellows, were the following: 1. The priest formally examined the leper outside the camp, and

made up his mind that he was clean. 2. An earthen vessel was brought with fresh water, and one of two birds was killed, and its blood was allowed to run into this water. 3. The other bird was taken and dipped in the vessel, with a piece of cedar wood and hyssop, which had first been tied together by a band of scarlet wool; and the leper was sprinkled seven times with the blood and water dripping from the feathers of the living bird. 4. The priest pronounced the man clean. 5. The bird was let fly into the open field. 6. The man washed his clothes, shaved his whole body, and bathed. 7. He returned within the camp, but not yet to his tent.

Ver. 3.—*The priest.* The agent is still the priest, not the physician. The priest shall go forth out of the camp. “May we not (as Hesychius suggests) see a figure here of the compassion of our Great High Priest, who has *gone forth out of heaven* itself, the camp of angel hosts, and has come down to earth, not only to examine but to heal the moral leprosy of sin, ‘to seek and to save the lost’ (Luke xix. 10), and who carefully examines and scrutinizes all the secrets of all hearts (Heb. iv. 12)? And he was exempt from all contagion of sin while he lived and moved among sinners (Matt. ix. 11; Luke xv. 1), and was ‘holy, harmless, and undefiled’ (Heb. vii. 26) (Wordsworth). And the priest shall look. In later times it was ordered that the examination was not to take place on the sabbath, nor in the early morning, nor in the late afternoon, nor inside a house, nor on a

cloudy day, nor in the glare of midday, and that the priest must have good eyesight, and only determine one case at a time; nor was he allowed to pronounce judgment on his own kindred. And, behold, if the plague of leprosy be healed in the leper. The plague of leprosy is healed before the ceremony of purification begins, but the leper is not pronounced clean until he has been sprinkled with the blood and water (ver. 7).

Ver. 4.—Cedar wood, and scarlet, and hyssop. “Cedar wood, and hyssop, and scarlet” are also to be burnt with the red heifer for the ashes for the water of separation (Numb. xix. 6), and they appear to have been commonly employed in purifications (Heb. ix. 19). The antiseptic properties of cedar made it peculiarly suitable for such occasions. The hyssop “was probably not the plant which we call hyssop, the *Hyssopus officinalis*, for it is uncertain whether this is to be found in Syria and Arabia, but a species of *origanum* resembling hyssop, the Arabian *zōter*, either wild marjoram, or a kind of thyme” (Keil on Exod. xii. 21). The Psalmist’s cry, “Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean” (Ps. li. 7), shows the common use to which it was put. In the present case, the sweet smell both of the wood (one cubit’s length of which was used) and of the herb would have still further adapted them for symbolizing the redemption of the leper’s flesh from corruption and putrefaction. The scarlet was probably a band of scarlet wool with which the cedar and the hyssop were tied—not to the bird (for we have no account of their being afterwards removed), but (as in the burning of the red heifer) one to the other. The colour of the wool was appropriate, not only because it was about to be dipped in the blood and water, but also because it symbolized the purified and now healthy blood.

Ver. 5.—One of the birds be killed in an earthen vessel over running water. A small quantity of water was placed in an earthenware dish, and one of the birds was killed over the dish in such a way that the blood dripped into the water. The water was needed, as there would not have been sufficient blood in the bird for the seven sprinklings which were to be made. It was to be running, literally, living, water; that is, fresh water taken from a fountain or a running stream, in order that it might be as pure as possible. Symbolically, the cleansing power of water as well as of blood is indicated.

Ver. 6.—As for the living bird, he shall take it. The wings and tail of the bird were extended, and in this position it was dipped into the blood and water in the earthenware dish, and with it, the bunch made up of cedar, hyssop, and scarlet wool

Ver. 7.—And he shall sprinkle upon him that is to be cleansed from the leprosy seven times. It is not certain whether the seven sprinklings were made upon the forehead of the person to be cleansed, or on the back of his hand. The feathers of the bird and the bunch of hyssop would be specially instrumental in the seven sprinklings. And shall pronounce him clean. Having assured himself that he was healed (ver. 8), the priest now pronounces him to be clean. He looses as well as binds. It had been his office to declare the man a leper, and thereby to shut him out from the people of the Lord (ch. xiii. 8, 15, 22, 25, 36, 44, 46). Now he pronounces him to be no leper, and therefore, after some further ceremonies, readmits him (vers. 8, 20, 31). And shall let the living bird loose into the open field. The symbolism of the two birds, which has been much misinterpreted, is essentially the same as that of the two goats on the day of atonement, though each ceremony has its distinctive features. The killing of the living bird was not a true sacrifice, as was the offering of the goat to Jehovah, but by its death it represented the state in which the leper had legally been, and to which he would have been physically reduced had not a remedy been found. The deathly and unclean state of the leper having been symbolically transferred from the dead bird to the living bird by the latter’s being sprinkled in the former’s blood, the living bird stands in the position of the scapegoat, on whom the sins of the people were laid. The bird is then let loose into the open field; literally, upon the face of the field; and it flies off, carrying with it the leper’s uncleanness, and assuring him by every forward movement that it makes that the living death has passed from him, just as each step of the scapegoat appeared to the Israelites to remove their sins from them. A large number of commentators, on the other hand, consider the released bird to symbolize the health and freedom now given back to the leper, and they dwell on the rapid and uncontrolled movement of birds as being peculiarly suitable for representing this recovered liberty. But this interpretation, to which there are many objections, appears to be altogether incompatible with the fact that the same ceremony is used in the cleansing of the leper house, whereas the house could certainly not be represented as “recovered to unrestrained liberty” (Lange). The common patristic view, that the two birds represent the two natures of the one Great Sacrifice offered to redeem man from sin, seems to be out of place here.

Ver. 8.—After the healed leper has washed his clothes, and shaved off all his hair, and washed himself with water, so as to leave no

remnant of his former defilement that can be removed, the first stage of his purification is over. He is restored to the camp, but not yet to the sanctuary, nor to his position as head or member of his family. He has still to undergo another week's purgation, and until that time has elapsed he may not live in his tent.

Vers. 9—32.—The ceremonies in the second stage of cleansing, which restored the late outcast to his home and to his covenant-right, were the following: 1. At the end of seven days he repeated the process of washing, shaving, and bathing. 2. On the eighth day he brought a lamb for a trespass offering, a log of oil, a meat offering, a sin offering, and a burnt offering. 3. The priest that officiated at the cleansing presented him and his offerings at the door of the tabernacle. 4. He offered the trespass offering and the log of oil for him. 5. He slew the trespass offering, and put some of the blood of it on different parts of the man's body. 6. He poured some of the oil into his left hand, and having sprinkled some of it seven times before the Lord, he placed some of it on those parts of the man's body on which the blood had been placed, and poured the rest upon his head. 7. He offered the sin offering, the burnt offering, and the meat offering.

Ver. 9.—But it shall be on the seventh day. The pause for seven days, followed by placing the blood on the tip of the right ear, and on the thumb of the right hand, and on the great toe of the right foot, and the subsequent anointing with oil, irresistibly call to mind the ceremonies of the consecration of priests (ch. viii. 35, 23, 24, 12, 30), and no doubt they are intended to do so. The whole nation was in a sense a priestly nation, and the restoration of the leprous member to his rights was therefore a quasi-consecration.

Ver. 10.—On the eighth day he shall take two he lambs without blemish, and one ewe lamb of the first year without blemish, and three tenth deals of fine flour. Every sacrifice is to be provided and offered by the restored leper, except the peace offering. It is certainly singular that the peace offering should be omitted, and that the trespass offering should be required. The former fact may be accounted for by the supposition that though the peace offering was not required, the late leper was, after his other sacrifices, put in a position where he might offer it when he would of his own free will. But the requirement of the trespass offering is more difficult to explain. What wrong had the leper done? and what satisfaction had he to make? The usual answer to this question is that he had wronged Jehovah in that, however involuntarily, he had failed

to bring him the offerings and service which he would have brought had he not been excluded from the camp. But this is a very forced explanation, and it is incompatible with other parts of the Law. For the leper was not the only unclean person who, owing to his uncleanness, was prevented from offering his gifts and worship at the tabernacle or temple. The woman who had an issue of blood for twelve years (Luko viii. 43) during that time would have been excluded from the sanctuary. But no trespass offering is required of those that have been unclean through issues. We must, therefore, look for some other explanation of the requirement in the case of the cleansed leper. And a simpler one is at hand. Leprosy was the type of sin—of all sin whatsoever. When, therefore, the expiatory sacrifices were demanded, both kinds—the trespass offering and the sin offering—had to be offered, because expiation had to be made for the uncleanness which represented all unrighteousness—trespasses as well as sins. It might be that the man had not committed a trespass; he might also not have committed sin; but he had been stricken with the foul disease which symbolized both one and the other, and therefore he had to offer on his cleansing the sacrifice appropriate to each. There is a difference in the ritual of the trespass offering in the present case, intended perhaps to distinguish it from those trespass offerings which were made when a man had in his mind a certain wrong or injury which he had committed, and for which he wished to make compensation. On this occasion (1) the animal presented was not required to be of a particular value, as in the ordinary trespass offerings; (2) it was waved, whereas the ordinary trespass offerings were not waved; (3) it was waved by the priest, whereas other wave offerings were waved not by the priest, but by the offerer, whose hands were guided by the priests. Nor (4) did the offering of oil accompany the presentation of other trespass offerings. For whatever reason it be, the most characteristic feature of the sacrificial cleansing of the leper is the trespass offering, and the way that it was dealt with.

Ver. 12.—The log of oil, amounting to something more than half a pint, is waved by the priest, together with the lamb for the trespass offering, as a wave offering before the Lord, in order that a special consecration may be given them. They thus become qualified for the purposes for which they are presently used.

Ver. 14.—And the priest shall take some of the blood of the trespass offering, and the priest shall put it upon the tip of the right ear of him that is to be cleansed. The

Mishna describes the ceremony as follows:—  
“The leper stands before the trespass offering, lays his hand upon it and kills it. Two priests catch up the blood one in a vessel, the other in his hand. He who catches it up in the vessel goes and throws it on the side of the altar, and he who catches it in his hand goes and stands before the leper. And the leper who had previously bathed in the court of the lepers, goes and stands in the gate of Nicanor. Rabbi Jehudah says he needs not bathe. He thrusts in his head (viz. into the great court, which he may not yet enter), and the priest puts of the blood upon the tip of his ear; he thrusts in his hand, and he puts it upon the thumb of his hand; he thrusts in his foot, and he puts it upon the great toe of his foot” (*Negaim*, xiv. 7, quoted by Ederheim, ‘Temple Service,’ ch. xviii.). No doubt, the ear, the thumb, and the great toe are selected for the purpose of showing, as in the case of the consecration of the priest, that the senses and the active powers of the restored Israelite must be dedicated henceforth to God.

Vers. 15—18.—And the priest shall take some of the log of oil, and pour it into the palm of his own left hand. This ceremony is altogether peculiar to this purification. The joint use of blood and oil is not singular (see ch. viii. 30), but elsewhere there is no sprinkling of the oil . . . seven times before the Lord, and in the consecration of priests there was no anointing of the different members with oil as well as with blood. The Mishna (as before cited) continues the description of the ceremony as follows:—“The priest now takes from the log of oil and pours it into the palm of his colleague, though if he poured it into his own it were valid. He dips his finger and sprinkles seven times towards the holy of holies,

dipping each time he sprinkles. He goes before the leper, and on the spot where he had put the blood he puts the oil, as it is written, ‘Upon the blood of the trespass offering.’ And the remnant of the oil that is in the priest’s hand, he pours on the head of him that is cleansed, for an atonement; if he so puts it, he is stoned for, but if not, he is not stoned for. So Rabbi Akiba. Rabbi Jochanan, the son of Nuri, saith, This is only the remnant of the ordinance, whether it be done or not, the atonement is made; but they impute it to him (the priest), as if he had not made atonement.” The double sprinkling with blood and oil betokened dedication as in the case of the priests, the blood specially denoting reconciliation, and the oil the strengthening power of God by which the new life was to be led.

Vers. 19, 20.—The priest shall offer the sin offering. The sin offering is due, according to the regulation given in ch. v. 3, in consequence of the man having been in a state of uncleanness. It is followed by the burnt offering and the meat offering, and then the man is restored to his state of legal cleanness, and of communion with God as well as with his fellows.

Vers. 21—32.—And if he be poor, and can not get so much. The concession to poverty consists in the substitution of two turtle-doves, or two young pigeons, for the two lambs required for the sin offering and the burnt offering, and one tenth-deal of flour for three tenth-deals of flour in the meat offering. But no difference is made as to the lamb required for the trespass offering, or the log of oil. These must be provided by the poor as well as by the rich, and the ceremonies used at their offering must be the same for poor and rich, as they are essential to the rite,

#### HOMILETICS.

Vers. 1—32.—*The cleansing of the leper represents the absolution of the sinner, as his exclusion from the camp represented spiritual excommunication.*

I. THE LAW OF CHRISTIAN EXCOMMUNICATIO AND ABSOLUTION. “I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven” (Matt. xvi. 19). “Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven” (Matt. xviii. 18). “Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained” (John xx. 23).

II. THE USE OF KEYS. 1. To admit. 2. To shut out. 3. To readmit. 1. The spiritual keys are used by God’s ministers for the purpose of admission, whenever they introduce into Christ’s kingdom, the Church, a new member by the use of the initiatory rite of baptism, which they are commissioned to employ for that end. 2. They are used for the purpose of exclusion, whenever the Church, or any duly constituted section of the Church, following the example of the Corinthian Church, as instructed and

guided by St. Paul, shuts out from its fold one who has been guilty of gross immorality (1 Cor. v.) or of depraving the faith (1 Tim. i. 20), and continues obstinate in his sin. 3. They are used for the purpose of readmission, when the Church has become satisfied that the sinner whom she had excluded from her fold has ceased to be a sinner, and thereupon, like the Corinthian Church, once more under the direction of St. Paul, "forgives him and comforts him, lest such an one should be swallowed up with overmuch sorrow," and confirms its love towards him (2 Cor. ii. 7, 8).

**III. THE FORMS FOR ADMISSION, EXCLUSION, AND READMISSION IN THE OLD AND NEW DISPENSATIONS.** The form of admission into covenant with himself is, as we should expect, fixed by Divine authority in both dispensations. In the old dispensation it was circumcision. "Every man child among you shall be circumcised. And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin; and it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you. And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man child in your generations, . . . and my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant" (Gen. xvii. 10—13). In the New Testament it is baptism in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. "Go ye therefore, and teach (make disciples of) all nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost" (Matt. xxviii. 19). "Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ" (Gal. iii. 26, 27). These forms are unchangeable by any human authority.

The form of exclusion from the covenant people was not so definitely fixed under the old as the new dispensation. In the former it is ordained that for various transgressions a soul shall be cut off. "The uncircumcised man child whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people; he hath broken my covenant" (Gen. xvii. 14). "If a man shall lie with a woman having her sickness, . . . both of them shall be cut off from among their people" (ch. xx. 18). But it is only in the case of leprosy that the method of exclusion is given in detail. There we have seen that it is to consist of a careful examination on the part of God's priest, and a pronouncement by him of the undoubted existence of the uncleanness in the person suspected, after which the latter is to exhibit all the signs of one mourning for himself as dead, to dwell alone, and "without the camp shall his habitation be" (ch. xiii. 45, 46). So in the New Testament the power of "binding" as well as of "loosing," and of "retaining" bound as well as of "forgiving," is granted, and the obligation of exerting this power is involved in its grant; but no especial form by which it is to be done is given. It is only in the case of the incestuous Corinthian that we have an example of the way in which St. Paul judges that it shall be done. From thence it appears that the decision is to be passed by the chief Church officer, in the name of Jesus Christ, and promulgated by the assembled Church, the result being that the offender is translated from the kingdom of Christ to the outer world, the kingdom of Satan, "for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus" (1 Cor. v. 3—5).

Nor is there any form definitely appointed either in the old or in the new dispensation for the readmission of those that had been cast out. No doubt in the old dispensation, it was always effected by the means of sacrifice, but we have a definite statement of the form adopted only in the case of reconciliation after leprosy. This form we have seen to be very elaborate and significative. Similarly in the new dispensation, we find no form authoritatively given for the restoration of the penitent; only we have, as before, the instance of the incestuous Corinthian, from which we learn that after sufficient punishment such a one is to be forgiven and taken back to the love of the brethren; and we have the general principle laid down elsewhere, "If a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual, restore such an one in the spirit of meekness; considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted" (Gal. vi. 1).

The fact of a divinely authorized form being given for admission into covenant with God, but none for exclusion from it by excommunication or readmission to it by absolution, is significant. The first is under the new dispensation a sacrament ordained of Christ; the others are ecclesiastical rites, valuable for the well-being of the Church, but not appointed by its Founder as a necessary condition of its existence.

**IV. THE OFFICE OF THE PRIEST IN CLEANSING.** 1. He did not cure the leprosy.

"If the plague of leprosy be healed in the leper" (ver. 3), then the priest shall begin the cleansing ceremonies. The healing of the disease was the work of God. 2. The action of the priest is necessary for the cleansing. If the *healing* is the work of God, the *cleansing* is the work of the priest. It is a complex ceremonial act, the result of which is not to deliver from the leprosy, but to serve as an assurance to the man himself and to the whole community that he is delivered from it, and therefore fit to be reinstated, and by that act reinstated, in the position of full communion which he had lost. So with absolution; it is God alone that forgives and heals sin. But after this has been accomplished, still it is necessary that a solemn ecclesiastical ceremony should reinstate in the communion of the faithful one who has been formally severed from it. And where the formal act of severance has not taken place, but a man's distressed conscience tells him that he has separated himself from God, and can hardly allow him to believe in his forgiveness, the solemn declaration of that forgiveness by God's minister serves as an assurance to the trembling soul, and restores to him the sense of peace which was lost.

#### HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

*The cleansing of sin as illustrat'd in the cleansing of the leper.* Ch. xiv.; cf. 2 Kings v.; Matt. viii. 1-4; Luke v. 12-15. We have seen the possibility of a cure of leprosy in the directions for its diagnosis given to the priests. The cured leper had also to be cleansed before admitted to the society of the faithful. In this chapter we have the cleansing of the leper detailed. In this we are to discern the cleansing of sin.

Nasman's case is instructive upon this point. He was cured by Divine power. But he was not ceremonially cleansed or received into the fellowship of the Church of God. In his case the two elements of cure and cleansing were separated. But when our Lord directed the cured leper to go and offer for his cleansing the gift that Moses commanded for a testimony unto them, the elements were united. In the case of the cure of the leprosy of sin and its concomitant, the cleansing, the Great Physician who cures and the Priest who cleanses are one. It is our Divine Saviour who accomplishes both.

I. **WE MUST NOT CONFFOUND THE CURE WITH THE CLEANSING OF SIN.** The cure of sin is the sanctification of the inward nature, the imparting of the principle of righteousness, the regeneration of the once unholy nature. This is quite distinct from the cleansing which proceeds from the blood of Jesus Christ. In the latter case there is a justification through faith in his blood, so that we are accepted as well as pardoned on the ground of his merits. The one is a work of God *in us*, the other is a work of God *on us*. We are not accepted because we are regenerated; we are accepted "in the Beloved." The leper was not accepted on the ground of his cure, but on the ground of his sacrifice. The ritual of the leper is, therefore, admirably adapted to keep the two ideas distinct of justification and sanctification.

II. **THE RESTORATION OF THE LEPER EMBRACED TWO STAGES, WHICH HAVE THEIR COUNTERPART IN THE EXPERIENCE OF THE SINNER.** These stages are, first, the restoration of the leper to the society of the living, and, secondly, his restoration to the society of the saints.

1. *Restoration to the society of the living.* The priest was directed to go to the leper outside the camp, and if he was satisfied about his cure, then he was to receive on the leper's behalf "two live birds, and cedar wool, and scarlet, and hyssop." One of these is to be killed in an earthen vessel over running water, and its blood mingled with the water in the vessel. Of the cedar wood, scarlet wool, and hyssop the priest is to make a brush, in which he is temporarily to tie the remaining live bird, and having dipped them in the blood and water, he is to sprinkle therewith the leper seven times, pronouncing him clean, and then let the live bird free. The leper is then to wash his clothes, shave off all his hair, wash himself carefully, and come into the camp, waiting, however, a week before taking up his permanent abode in his own tent.

Now, it seems clear that in this first stage of the leper's restoration the live bird, baptized with water and blood, and then let loose to join its mates in the open fields, was a symbol of the healed leper, now to be restored to the fellowship of men. It has

been, indeed, said that the live bird here is parallel to the live goat on the Day of Atonement, and should rather be supposed to carry the leper's sin away. But, inasmuch as the live bird here receives a similar baptism to the leper himself, the first interpretation is preferable. Living water and blood, therefore, are the elements of the leper's purification—symbols of the Spirit and the blood of Jesus Christ. The brush of hyssop was the means by which these were applied to the leper, and might fittingly represent the Word of God, immortal like the cedar, humiliating like the hyssop, and invigorating like the "coccus-wool," by which the atonement and Spirit of Christ are applied to the sinful soul. It is thus by the blood of Jesus and the Spirit of Jesus that the soul, dead through the leprosy of sin, is restored to the society of the living. "And thou hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins" (Eph. ii. 1).

2. *Restoration to the society of the saints.* After seven days' sojourn in the camp, but not in his own tent, the leper was allowed to approach the tabernacle with two he-lambs without blemish, one ewe-lamb without blemish of the first year, and three tenth-deals of fine flour for a meat offering, mingled with oil, and one log of oil. These were to be used as a trespass offering, a sin offering, and a burnt offering. These suggest respectively a sense of *unprofitableness* or shortcoming, *atonement*, and *personal consecration*. The blood of the trespass offering is to be applied to the right ear, thumb of right hand, and great toe of the right foot, and the oil of consecration to be added thereto. This corresponds exactly to the consecration of the priests (ch. viii.). It suggests that it is *out of a sense of past unprofitableness that future consecration comes* (cf. Luke xvii. 5—10). It is when we realize how we have wronged our Lord that we are prepared to live, not unto ourselves, but unto him who died for us, as our atoning Sacrifice, and rose again (2 Cor. v. 14, 15). In case of the poverty of the leper, he is instructed to bring one lamb for the trespass offering, with turtle-doves or young pigeons, in place of two additional lambs, for the sin offering and burnt offering, and a smaller meat offering. But the emphasis being laid on the trespass offering is surely to show that a sinner, when quickened by the Lord, is to sincerely lament the profitless, isolated life he lived, and to resolve to dedicate himself with full purpose of heart to the service of the Saviour whose blood has taken away his sin. The saints are those who begin in a sense of trespass a life of grateful devotion.

III. **MAN'S HOME IS TO BE CLEANSED AND RESTORED IN THE SAME SPIRIT AS HIMSELF.** The priest is directed to investigate a plagued house, and if by the use of prompt measures the plague is stayed and extirpated, then the first part of the ritual is to be carried out. One live bird is to be killed over the running water, and the house sprinkled with the blood and water as before, and then the other live bird liberated. Thus was the restoration of the house to the society of its mates, so to speak, symbolized. We have already taken this to indicate the careful purification of our environment, and there is no more important duty attaching to the religious man. Atonement is due, not only for the sin as it affects the person, but for sin in its ravages in the world. This blighted world of ours has need of atoning blood, and purification even by fire, before it can be restored to the favour of God. Christ has consecrated it through his blood, and his providence and Spirit will yet make the requisite arrangement for its complete purification and restoration to the holy.

—R. M. E.

**Vers. 1—20.—Restoration suggestions.** The ceremonies here enjoined in the event of leprosy being healed suggest four things.

I. **AN INTERESTING PASSAGE IN THE LIFE OF OUR LORD.** Our Saviour's experiences may be divided into: (1) his sufferings and death; (2) his life (and example); (3) his works. Of these the last may be the least important, but they will never be unimportant. They will always remain one strong, convincing proof of his Godhead. And of these works the healing of leprosy—incurable by human art—was one of the most decisive. In this work of mercy, more vividly than in any other, we see him before us as the Divine Healer of the sin-smitten heart of man. Great interest belongs, therefore, to the incident related in Luke v. 12—15. And in the instruction given in ver. 14 we see our Divine Lord: (1) mindful of the Law of Moses, which he ever honoured (Matt. iii. 15; v. 17); (2) while desirous of avoiding a noisy and hurtful notoriety, taking due measures to establish the reality of his work.

II. THE CONSIDERATION WE OWE TO OUR FELLOW-MEN. In virtue of the Divine precept the leper might not enter human society. But this was not the only ground of exclusion; by reason of the character of his malady he was wholly unfit to enter. Once exiled, therefore, he might not return until every guarantee had been given that he was "whole," until numerous and prolonged ceremonies of cleansing had removed all stigma from him, and made him likely to receive a cordial welcome back. Hence the elaborate ceremonial of the text: (1) priestly examination (vers. 2, 3); (2) the ceremony of the two birds (vers. 4-7); (3) personal ablution (ver. 8); (4) further exclusion for a week (ver. 8); (5) additional ablution, etc. (ver. 9); (6) offerings at the altar, attended with peculiar rites with the blood and oil (vers. 10-20). When by any folly or guilt of ours we have incurred the distrust or dislike of our brethren, it is due to them that we should give them every possible guarantee of our "cleanness," our integrity of heart and life, before they abandon their suspicion and give us again their cordial confidence. Society has a right to require that the man whom it has necessarily shunned is pure of his moral and spiritual malady. We may be unable to gain any certificate of character, but we may, to regain confidence and readmission to human fellowship, (1) show ourselves as humble, earnest worshippers in the house of the Lord; (2) seek the open confidence of the acknowledged servants of Christ; (3) give the pledge of a scrupulously virtuous life, that we are really "washed and sanctified . . . by the Spirit of our God" (1 Cor. vi. 11).

III. THE OBLIGATIONS OF OFFICE. Those who hold high office have sometimes uninviting duties to discharge. The priests of Israel held honourable rank in the nation; doubtless they received a large share of public deference, and were regarded as those who occupied an enviable position. But their duties embraced some offices from which the humblest in the land might shrink. They had to make a most careful examination of the man who believed himself healed of leprosy. Probably, in their eagerness to return to the camp, these afflicted ones often sought readmission when the disease was still upon them. But the priest must examine all who came, clean or unclean. Those who now hold honourable positions in society (the minister, the medical man, etc.) must hold themselves ready, not only to do those duties which are inviting and congenial, but those also which are unpleasant and even painful, whether to the flesh or to the spirit.

IV. THE OUTLOOK OF HUMAN MISERY. What was the prospect of the exiled leper? Human art had given him up as incurable, and human fellowship had cast him out as unworthy. What could he hope for? There were only two possible remedies—a Divine cure or the grave; the one blessed enough but sadly improbable, the other sad enough but a welcome certainty. If for a while we look at leprosy as the picture, not of human sin, but of human misery, we may be reminded that, for a Christian man, there are two remedies: (1) deliverance in time from affliction (Ps. xxx. 11); (2) comfort in affliction during life, and then "the glory which shall be revealed" (Rom. viii. 18). Though the night of weeping be life-long, "yet joy cometh in the morning" of the everlasting day.—C.

Vers. 4-9.—*Admission (or readmission).* When leprosy had departed from the flesh, he who had been, but no longer remained, a leper was, in the sight of Jehovah and of his people, still ceremonially unclean. He was in a bodily condition which made him *readmissible* to Divine and human fellowship, but he must first "be cleansed" (ver. 4) before he would be *readmitted*. The ceremonies here prescribed give a picture of our readmission to the favour of God and the fellowship of his people.

I. SACRIFICE OF ANOTHER'S LIFE. As a "clean bird" (ver. 4) was taken and its blood was shed (ver. 5), as the life-blood of the pure and innocent creature was poured out that the leper might be clean and pure in the sight of God, so is the life-blood of the spotless Lamb shed for us. There must be for our acceptance and admission, or readmission after backsliding, a "sacrifice for sin."

II. PERSONAL APPLICATION OF THAT SACRIFICE. "He shall sprinkle upon him that is to be cleansed . . . seven times" (ver. 7). "The living bird" was to be "dipped in the blood of the bird that was killed." Here is the truth that if the "blood of Christ" is to be effectual for our salvation, it *must be applied* to our individual con-

science. We who seek to be cleansed from all iniquity and condemnation, must ourselves personally apply for mercy through the shed blood of the Redeemer. By an act of living faith we must bathe in the "fountain opened for sin and for uncleanness."

III. PERSONAL PUTTING AWAY OF DEFILEMENT. The leper was to "wash his clothes, and shave off all his hair, and wash himself in water, that he may be clean." And again, after a week's interval, was to shave and to wash, removing all his hair, even to the eyebrows (ver. 9); everything about him that could in any possible way be defiled by the plague was to be carefully removed. So, if we are to be admitted (or readmitted) to God's favour and man's communion, we must deliberately put away from ourselves, from heart and life, every evil way, everything which is, or may be, tainted with iniquity (2 Tim. ii. 19).

IV. DIVINE ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF OUR INTEGRITY. Everything here pointed to the fact that the Divine Ruler of Israel was prepared to acknowledge the cleanliness of the leper. The water was to be "running water" (ver. 5)—pure, as opposed to that which was stagnant and foul; "cedar wood" was to be used (ver. 6), type of that which is fragrant and healthful; the "scarlet" wool (ver. 6) hinted the red and healthy blood, which had been impure but was so no longer; "hyssop" (ver. 6) was suggestive of fragrance; but that which, above all, was indicative of God's acknowledgment of the wholeness of the leper was the action respecting the living bird: that was released, let "loose into the open field" (ver. 7). This either signified that the uncleanness of the leper was borne away on the wings of the bird, where it should never be found again (a similar institution to the scapegoat, ch. xvi. 22, 23), or that the leper was thenceforth free to go whithersoever he pleased. Either way, it expressed symbolically the truth that there was reinstatement for the man who had been healed in the privileges he had forfeited. We have in the Scriptures every possible assurance that "repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ," are followed by fulness of Divine favour. The returned prodigal has the kiss of reconciliation, the ring and robe of honour, and the feast of joy. "Being justified by faith, we have peace with God . . . and rejoice in hope of the glory of God" (Rom. v. 1, 2). The soul that is healed of its sore disease is pronounced clean in the sight of God, and is free of its Father's house, to enter its many rooms and partake of its many joys.—C.

Vers. 10—20.—*Final rites of readmission.* By the series of final rites of restoration recorded in these verses, the leper once more took his place as one of a holy nation admitted to the presence of God: he was "presented before the Lord at the door of the tabernacle," etc. (ver. 10). His formal acceptance at the house of the Lord, and entrance again on the privileges of the peculiar people, reminds us that our entrance, whether in the first instance or after backsliding and return, upon the fulness of sacred privilege must be—

I. ATTENDED WITH HUMILITY. The leper was to bring his sin offering, which must be slain in the holy place (vers. 13, 19). Over the head of the animal he was to confess his sin, and then, with his guilt thus transferred, the blood of the sin offering atoned for past wrong. All approaches to God by the human spirit should be accompanied with a sense of unworthiness. "Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. v. 3).

II. IN THE SPIRIT OF CONSECRATION. The leper was to bring his burnt offering as well as his sin offering (vers. 13, 19, 20). By this he symbolically presented himself wholly unto the Lord, laid himself on the altar of sacred service. When we turn, or return, unto God it must be in the spirit of full, unreserved dedication. We are to "present our bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, our reasonable (i.e. rational, spiritual) service" (Rom. xii. 1).

III. IN THE SPIRIT OF THANKFUL JOY. The leper was to bring "three tenth deals of fine flour for a meat offering, mingled with oil" (vers. 10, 20). This was a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, rendered under a sense of deep indebtedness for Divine bounty. It was certainly suitable enough in the case of the leper, whose malady had been removed by the healing hand of God. Nor is the consciousness of our deep indebtedness, the presentation of our utmost thanks, one whit less becoming, less demanded and required of God, when we come to his house, or to the table of the Lord, after months or years, or (it may be) a life of absence, negligence, estrangement. It

should be with hearts overflowing with holy gratitude and sacred joy that we present ourselves before him.

IV. WITH A SENSE OF GOD'S FULL ACCEPTANCE OF OUR WHOLE HEART AND LIFE. There was one very significant ceremony through which the leper who was being cleansed had to pass: the priest was to put some of the blood of the trespass offering upon the tip of the right ear, and the thumb of the right hand, and the great toe of the right foot (ver. 14). Afterwards the priest did the same thing with the oil, pouring the remnant of the oil upon the leper's head (vers. 17, 18). The application of the blood of atonement to these bodily extremities indicated God's acceptance of the leper throughout the entire man; every part of him was now holy unto the Lord; even every part of that bodily frame which had been the very picture and type of all uncleanness. The application of the oil denoted that the leper was thenceforth to regard himself as God's accepted servant in every sphere of human action; he was to be: 1. A reverent waiter and watcher before God, eagerly learning his will. 2. An active, industrious minister, doing his work in every way open to him. 3. A conscientious exemplar, walking in the ways of the Lord blameless. We, too, returning unto God, pleading the blood of the Lamb, offering ourselves unto him, reverently rejoicing in his mercy, are to understand and realize that (1) God accepts us unreservedly as his own, and (2) expects us to be eager to serve him in every open way—*learning, labouring, living* to his praise.—C.

Vers. 21-32.—*Divine considerateness.* If there had been one parenthetical verse introduced or added intimating that Divine allowance would be made for the poor, we should have thought that sufficient for the purpose. But we have more than that here. We have legislation for the poor fully stated, and the whole body of injunctions restated for their especial benefit (vers. 21-32). This brings out into bold relief God's mindfulness of the peculiar necessities of men—his Divine considerateness. We see illustrations of this in—

I. SACRIFICES BROUGHT TO HIS ALTAR. Notably this kindly provision for the poor in the case of the healed leper; but not this alone (see ch. v. 7; xii. 8).

II. GIFTS BROUGHT TO HIS TREASURY. The widow with her two mites cast in more, weighed in the balances of heaven, than did the rich with their abundance (Mark vii. 41-44; see 2 Cor. viii. 12).

III. OUR POWERS IN CHRIST'S SERVICE. To him who having received two talents gained two others beside them, was accorded by the Lord, when he returned and reckoned with his servants, approval quite as cordial as that rendered to him who having received five talents gained five talents more (Matt. xxv. 19-23). Equally cordial would have been the welcome to him who had been entrusted with only one, if he had gained one talent beside that.

IV. OUR STRUGGLE WITH TEMPTATION. When the agonizing Master returned and found those he left to watch and pray "asleep, for their eyes were heavy," he gently rebuked them; but he considerably extenuated their fault by saying, "The spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak" (Matt. xxvi. 40, 41). "He knoweth our frame; he remembereth that we are dust."

V. OUR ENDURANCE OF EVIL. God sends us privation, sickness, disappointment, perplexity, loss, bereavement, exceeding great sorrows, burdens grievous to be borne; he calls upon us to "endure as seeing him who is invisible," to be "in subjection to the Father of spirits." He expects that we shall not repine and rebel, but submit and serve. Yet he who knows all men, and who knows "what is in man" (John ii. 25), who created us and made us what we are, understands and weighs our peculiar personal difficulties, temperaments, dispositions; he knows how much we strive to yield and acquiesce, and "judges righteous judgment." He is *just, yet merciful*, we say. We may also say, He is *just, and therefore merciful*. He has the requisite justice of Divine considerateness.

Let us—1. Take heart to serve so gracious and considerate a Lord. 2. Feel impelled to serve him all the more faithfully and devotedly because he is so worthy and righteous a Master. 3. Try to copy his grace and his righteousness in our dealings with our fellows (Luke vi. 36).—C.

Vers. 1—20.—*Thorough purification.* Spiritual disease is often neglected by persons who are extremely anxious respecting some disease of the physical frame. For the former they seek no remedy, and display no concern as to its ultimate issue, whereas the latter is viewed with unceasing distress. Would that every spiritual leper entertained just conceptions regarding his state! The ceremonies of this chapter are pregnant with interest for us to-day. Two stages in the leper's cleansing are set before us.

I. THE RETURN TO THE CAMP. 1. The supposition that the leper might recover from his leprosy and be clean shows man's superiority to inanimate nature. When endeavours are being made to confound matter and mind, and to reduce man to a level with the earth on which he lives, it is not unworthy of notice that the legislator here marks a vital distinction between a man and a dwelling. The latter, if on investigation pronounced utterly unclean, was destroyed (ver. 45), and so with garments (ch. xiii. 52), but the leprous man ever contained possibilities of recovery. Let us hold fast to the truth here imaged, and delight in the thought that no sinner is beyond hope of amendment. 2. As the priest journeyed outside the camp to the leper (ver. 3), we are reminded of him who "suffered without the camp," who in his condescending love left his Father's throne to dwell with the outcasts of earth, and who in his abode with men selected not the richest and purest, but the poor and the sinful, as the recipients of his intimacy and favour. 3. The death of the one bird showed forth the condition from which, by God's grace, the leper had been rescued; the flight of the other bird, previously dipped in the blood, symbolized the enjoyment of life granted through the death of the appointed victim. How aptly does this apply to our deliverance through Jesus Christ, so that "we have passed from death unto life"! Delight in our present position should be combined with thankful remembrance of the means by which it has been secured to us. 4. The concomitants indicated the completeness of the new life received. There is no reason to reject the general interpretation that the cedar wood was an emblem of uncorruptness, the scarlet wool or braid of freshness and fulness of life, and the hyssop with its detergent properties of cleanliness. These were employed in the preparation of the "water for separation" (Numb. xix.). Jesus Christ came that we might "have life, and have it more abundantly." He brought "life and incorruption to light through the gospel." He quickens those "dead through trespasses and sins." Life that invigorates the entire spirit is his "free gift." 5. What trouble was necessary, and would be willingly incurred, in order to regain temporal advantages! Unless cleansed by ablution of himself and clothes, and the removal of hair from the head, no entrance into the assembly of his brethren was permissible. Yet how readily would all be performed, just as to-day no efforts are deemed too great to allow of participation in valued social or political movements! But for the cleansing from sin any commandment is accounted vexatious! Few care to sacrifice time or labour to become citizens of the heavenly commonwealth.

II. THE RETURN TO THE TENT. 1. The provision for restoring the leper proves that God has no desire to exclude men unnecessarily from religious privileges. The seven days' interval served to guard against a possible error on the part of the priest, and impressed the leper with a deeper conviction of the holiness of God. It is only sin that bars men from the light of God's presence, and only obstinate persistence in sin that need cause despair of forgiveness. "Ye will not come unto me that ye might have life" was our Lord's indictment of men's impenitent folly. 2. See, once more, the function of the priest to appear between man and God. "The priest that maketh him clean shall present the man before the Lord," and "the priest shall make an atonement for him before the Lord." We have our Advocate with the Father, in whose name, and sheltered by whose intercession, we may approach boldly the throne of grace. Hereafter he shall present us holy and without blemish, and unreprovable before him (Col. i. 22; Jude 24). Having Christ to introduce us, who can be afraid? 3. The cleansing not complete without an atonement. All marks of disease may have disappeared, or at least the fear of infection may have vanished, and yet to enter upon the fresh period of existence is not sufficient unless the past transgressions be remembered and atoned for. To forsake sin is well, but, in addition, the sin of the past must be confessed and pardoned. The sacrifice of Jesus Christ enables the sinner to start upon his pilgrimage with shoulders eased from the burden of guilt. A gulf separates him from the land of iniquity and stumbling; he is free to commence again under happier auspices. The old score is

wiped out; a clean tablet marks the returned prodigal's position. 4. The purification must be coextensive with the disease. Leprosy affected the whole man; hence the tips of the ear, the hand, and the foot must be touched with the atoning blood, that all parts may be redeemed from corruption. All spheres of activity must be brought under the power of the cross of Christ. 5. The cleansing becomes a consecration of the entire man. The resemblance of this rite to that enjoined at the setting apart of the priests to their holy office cannot fail to be observed. The leper offered a trespass offering to compensate for breaches of the commandment committed by reason of his absence through sin from the sanctuary, a sin offering because of transgressions inadvertently committed, a burnt offering as an act of individual worship in which there was self-surrender to the Lord, and a meat offering, the natural accompaniment testifying grateful homage. And, besides blood, oil also was sprinkled upon the leper, and poured upon his head, and sprinkled seven times (the covenant number) before the Lord, so that we have here a recognition of the truth that Israel was intended to be a "kingdom of priests." Typical of the sanctification required in the people of God, reaching to every part of their character, until all is brought into captivity to the obedience of Christ. "As ye presented your members servants to uncleanness and to iniquity unto iniquity, even so now present your members servants to righteousness unto sanctification." 6. The consecrated man is fit for the discharge of ordinary duties and the enjoyment of lawful pleasures. After the sacrifices, the man could once more enter his tent and mingle with his family, and pursue his wonted avocation. Jehovah proved himself in these regulations the God of the families of Israel. He protected their relationships and imparted to them his blessing. It is a mistaken idea to place affection for our kindred before love to God. Regard for God is the surest guarantee for the performance of human obligations. Well for the land if this were oftener remembered in the establishment of households and in the contracting of domestic ties!

**CONCLUSION.** Only when "clean" could the leper send for the priest. We go to Jesus Christ with all our guilt; he looks upon us and pronounces us clean, he touches us, and lo! we are healed; for there is sanatory power in his look and touch. What the Saviour exemplified when on earth, he is constantly effecting now from heaven.—S. R. A.

**Vers. 1-9.—*The cleansing of the leper—ceremonies outside the camp.*** As leprosy is evidently a remarkable emblem of sin, so must the cleansing of the leper represent the purification of the sinner, and the laws of the cleansing, the provisions of the gospel. The text brings under our notice—

**I. THE CONDITIONS REQUIRED.** These were: 1. *That the leprosy be healed.* (1) Healing and cleansing are distinct things. The priest did not heal. Before proceeding to cleanse he had to see that the leprosy was healed (ver. 3). Our Lord healed lepers, and then sent them to the priest to be cleansed (see Matt. viii. 2-4; Mark i. 40-44; Luke v. 12-14; xvii. 14). (2) The gospel of this is that repentance is not salvation. The body may be healed, outward reformation may be considerable, while the heart is morally putrescent (see Matt. xxiii. 25-28). The leper, though healed, unless also cleansed, must not enter the holy place or eat of the holy things. A genuine change of heart will manifest itself in a pure life. When these exist together, fellowship with God is established. 2. *That the priest certify the fact.* (1) "He shall be brought unto the priest," viz. for this purpose. He is brought by his friends, or they apprise the priest of his condition. Those are the true friends of sinners who bring them to Jesus in person or in prayer. (2) "The priest shall go forth out of the camp." This did Jesus, who came to seek and save the lost. The Pharisees found fault with him for mingling with "publicans and sinners" when he acted as the priest among the lepers. (3) The repentance that satisfies Jesus is genuine (see Luke xviii. 10-14). And this he certifies in his offices of cleansing.

**II. THE OFFERING MADE.** 1. *The sacrifice.* (1) This consisted of two birds. We say "this" in the singular, for the birds must be together viewed as one sacrifice. Unitedly they were intended to prefigure the one true Sacrifice for sins. (2) The birds were "alive," to represent him that "hath life in himself." (3) They were "clean." They might be sparrows or quails—any wild birds of the clean kinds. Cleanliness was requisite to foreshadow One whose birth and life were spotlessly pure. 2. *Its treatment.* (1) One bird was killed over running or "living" water, which was the emblem of the living,

purifying Spirit of God. Blood and water together flowed from the opened side of Jesus (see John xix. 34, 35; 1 John v. 6, 8). The infinitely superior virtue of the blood of Christ lay in that, being God as well as man, he was able to offer himself *through the eternal Spirit* without spot (Heb. ix. 13, 14). (2) The “living bird” was dipped “in the blood of the bird that was killed,” to show that our guilt was laid upon the *soul* of Jesus as well as upon his body. This truth is indeed expressed in the *blood* shed; for the “blood is the life of the flesh.” But to impress it upon us it is here presented under another figure (see Isa. liii. 10—12).

III. ITS APPROPRIATION. This was: 1. *Through the sprinkling of blood.* (1) The atonement availed the leper nothing without the application of the blood to his person. So the blood of Christ avails only to those who appropriate its benefits by faith. (2) The blood was sprinkled upon the leper “seven times” to express perfection and sufficiency, and to point to the seventh period or rest of the gospel (Heb. iv. 10), in which the atonement by Christ satisfies all the promises of the types. Then he was pronounced “clean.” (3) The next thing was to let the living bird, stained with the blood of that killed in sacrifice, loose in the open field. What a lively picture! As the leper is assured that he is clean he sees his guilt carried away, and loses sight of it as the bird disappears in the wood. So does Christ bear our sins into oblivion. 2. *Through the washing of water.* (1) The leper was to wash his clothes and appear in clean white linen, the emblem of the “righteousness of the saints.” (2) He had also to shave off all his hair, which had been dishonoured by the plague, that a new growth might crown him in purity. (3) He had likewise to wash his flesh; and that too “seven times,” to express the thoroughness of his purification (comp. 2 Kings v. 10; also Ps. li. 2). But the true purifier is that sevenfold Spirit of the gospel, issuing as the river of life, from the throne of God and of the Lamb (Rev. v. 6; xxii. 1). 3. *By the ministry of the word.* (1) The blood was sprinkled upon the leper by means of a whisk composed of “cedar wood, and scarlet, and hyssop.” A branch of hyssop seems to have been tied to a handle of cedar by a thread of scarlet wool. But the materials used were evidently intended as emblems, else they would not have been so carefully specified. And we find these very materials on another occasion, thrown into the fire of the altar, to be consumed with the red heifer (see Numb. xix. 6). (2) As to the hyssop and cedar, they seem to be, as it were, at the extremes in the kingdom of trees, and so generally represent that kingdom. For Solomon in his wisdom “spake of trees, from the cedar tree that is in Lebanon even unto the hyssop that springeth out of the wall” (1 Kings iv. 33). We know that the servants of God are compared to trees (Ps. i. 3; xcii. 12; Isa. lxi. 3). They are various in their abilities, yet all serviceable as ministers and instruments of the gospel (1 Cor. xii. 21). (3) As to the wool; it is from the fleece of an animal proper for sacrifice, and its colour is that of blood. A cord of the same colour was hung from her window by Rahab, to express faith in the blood of the Passover to protect her and her house from destruction. It would not be lawful in her to sacrifice a lamb and sprinkle its blood; but she did what she might, and expressed her faith by this sign (Josh. iii. 18, 19). The scarlet cord of a common faith in the blood of Christ binds his servants together, and in their unity makes them efficient instruments in carrying his gospel to mankind. (4) If it be asked why should the cedar and scarlet and hyssop be burnt with the red heifer, the answer is that there is a sense in which faithful ministers may be “offered upon the sacrifice and service” of the faith of those they benefit (see Acts ix. 4; 2 Cor. i. 5, 6; iv. 10; Phil. ii. 17; iii. 10; Col. i. 24; 2 Tim. i. 8; ii. 10).—J. A. M.

Vers. 10—32.—*The cleansing of the leper—ceremony in the tabernacle.* The ceremonies for the cleansing of the leper were distributed into two series. The first were conducted “outside the camp.” This suggests that the leper must be taken not only as a type of sinners in general, but of the “sinners of the Gentiles” in particular (comp. Heb. xiii. 10—12). The ceremony in the tabernacle, therefore, must refer to the reception of the Gentiles by the gospel into the fellowship of the saints. We notice—

I. THE PRESENTATION. 1. *This took place on the eighth day.* (1) The ceremonies in the camp extended over seven days, on the last of which the leper was then pronounced clean. He was now, therefore, eligible to leave his alienation, and mingle

LEVITICUS.

Q

with the children of Israel as a fellow-citizen. (2) Entering the sanctuary, he came into Church recognition. For the court of the priests represented the Church in the visible part (see on ch. viii. 10—12). This was on the eighth day, which, in the week, corresponds with the first day, a day so memorable for great events of the gospel that, as the "Lord's day," it came to replace the Jewish "sabbath" (see on ch. ix. 1—7). The Hebrew term for eight (*שְׁמֵנָה*, *shemenah*, is derived from (*שֵׁמֶן*) *shemen*, fat or oil; and the oil and fat so extensively used in connection with the offerings and baptisms of the Law represented the Spirit of God in his illuminations and joy-inspiring graces. The eighth day, or *day of oil*, was, therefore, appropriately the emblem of the "days of the Son of man," the dispensations of the Spirit. 2. *He was introduced by the priest.* (1) He was presented "before the Lord" (ver. 11). As a commoner might be presented by a peer to a monarch at a *levée*, so was the leper presented by the priest to the Lord, who, in his Shechinah, was enthroned upon the mercy-seat. So are the spiritual priests of the gospel introduced by the Great High Priest of our profession (see Heb. x. 21, 22). (2) Being recognized by the King of glory, he became fit for the best society, and could freely mingle with the congregation of Israel, or princes of God. So when God accepts the sinner, though he had been a sinner of the Gentiles, that becomes his passport to the Church (see Acts x. 47). 3. *The leper did not appear empty.* (1) It would have been a departure from all precedent in the East to be presented to a monarch without bringing gifts. When the Queen of Sheba came to Solomon, she was laden with rich presents (1 Kings x. 10). (2) But when we come into the presence of God, what have we to bring? The leper brought three blemishless lambs; one for a trespass offering, another for a sin offering, and the third for a burnt offering. He brought also three tenth-deals of fine flour mingled with oil, for a bread offering, together with a log of oil. And we can bring Christ, with the Spirit of his grace, the antitypes. (3) But "shall we offer unto the Lord that which cost us nothing?" There was a commercial value in the gifts of the leper; but our "Gift" is "unspeakable," infinitely above all merchandise, such as we could never procure for ourselves. With him we must consecrate *ourselves*, and our *property* "as God may prosper us" (Rom. xii. 1; 1 Cor. xvi. 2).

II. THE CEREMONIES OF THE PRESENTATION. 1. *The sacrifices were of all the kinds.* (1) The lamb for the trespass offering. This was to make atonement for *transgression*, in order to *justification*. (2) The ewe-lamb for a sin offering. This was to make atonement for *impurity*, in order to *sanctification*. (3) The burnt offering, to make atonement for *irreverences* and *imperfections* in *adoration*. And with this was associated the bread offering, to express *gratitude* and *communion*. (4) The order is admirable. When our trespasses are *forgiven*, and our hearts *cleansed* from sin, then are we in the moral state to *adore* with *gratitude*. 2. *The baptisms were ample.* (1) The washings at the laver in the tabernacle appear to have been exclusively those of the sacrifices and priests. The baptisms of the Israelites were in their dwellings (Luke xi. 38). The leper was washed with water outside the camp. Cornelius and his company, in whom the kingdom of heaven was opened to the Gentiles by Peter's key, received the baptism of the Holy Ghost *before* they had any *visible* Church recognition (Acts x. 44—48). (2) The leper's baptisms of blood began outside the camp. The blood of the bird was there seven times sprinkled upon the leper. But now, in the tabernacle, he is again sprinkled with the blood of the trespass offering. It was put on the tip of his right ear, to engage him in future to hear the Law of God; on the thumb of his right hand, to engage him to do the will of God; and on the great toe of his right foot, to engage him to walk in his holy ways. (3) As there was no baptism of water ministered to the leper in the tabernacle, so was there no baptism of oil ministered to him outside the camp. Coming into the sanctuary, he sees the oil first "sprinkled seven times before the Lord" (ver. 16). Then oil was put upon him over the blood on the tip of his right ear, the thumb of his right hand, and the great toe of his right foot (ver. 17). The remnant of the oil was then poured upon his head. In this an "atonement was made for him before the Lord" (ver. 18). Bishop Patrick says, "The blood seems to have been a token of *forgiveness*; the oil of *healing*." Together they show the intimate connection between the Son of God and the Spirit of God in the work of redemption and salvation. 3. *The circumstances of the poor are considered.* (1) He may substitute doves for the lambs of the burnt offering and sin

offering, and one tenth-deal of flour for three. "My son, give me thine heart;" and with that the *calves of thy lips* shall be accepted instead of the *calves of the stall*. (2) But the lamb of the trespass offering he must bring. "This may well be looked upon as a figure of the Lamb of God, who alone taketh away the sins of the whole world" (Old Bible).—J. A. M.

### EXPOSITION.

**THE LEPROSY OF A HOUSE, AND ITS CLEANSING** (vers. 33-53). The subject of leprosy in houses must be regarded from the same point of view as that of leprosy in clothes. The regulations respecting it are not sanitary laws, as Lange represents them, but rest, as Keil argues, upon an ideal or symbolical basis. The same thought is attached to all species of uncleanness. Something—it matters not what—produces a foul and repulsive appearance in the walls of a house. That is in itself sufficient to make that house unclean; for whatever is foul and repulsive is representative of moral and spiritual defilement, and therefore is itself symbolically defiling and defiled. It has been suggested that the special cause of the affection of the houses in Canaan was saltpetre exuding from the materials employed in their building, or iron pyrites in the stone used. This may have been so, or more probably it was the growth of some fungus. Whatever it was, the appearance created by it was so similar to that of leprosy in the human body, as to derive its name from the latter by analogy.

Ver. 34.—When ye be come into the land of Canaan, which I give to you for a possession. This is the first instance of a law being given which has no bearing on the present condition of the Israelites, but is to regulate their conduct when they had come into the promised land. From the time of Abraham downwards, the assurance of their entrance into that land had been possessed by the people of Israel (Gen. xvii. 8), and the expectation of the speedy fulfilment of that promise had been quickened by their exodus from Egypt, and the preparations made to march through the wilderness. There would, therefore, be nothing surprising to them in receiving instruction to guide their conduct when the entrance should have been effected. As the question is one of leprosy, it is natural that it should be treated of with the leprosy of the human subject and the leprosy of garments; but as it is not of immediate application, it is

placed at the end, and dealt with after the rest of the subject has been discussed, being appended to the law of cleansing the leper, instead of preceding it. And I put the plague of leprosy in a house of the land of your possession. This expression has led to the idea that the leprosy of houses was a special infliction at God's hand in a manner different from other inflictions or diseases; but the words do not mean that. All that is done is in a sense done by God, inasmuch as his providence rules over all; and, therefore, by whatever secondary cause thing may be brought about, it is he that does it. It is God that feeds the birds (Luke xii. 24), God that clothes the grass (Luke xii. 28), nor does one sparrow fall to the ground without him (Matt. x. 29). It is he, therefore, that *puts the plague in a house*, as the Lord of all things (cf. Isa. xlvi. 6, 7, "I am the Lord, and there is none else. I form the light, and create darkness: I make peace, and create evil: I the Lord do all these things"). The expression militates, though not strongly, against the notion that the house caught the leprosy from the leper that lived in it.

Vers. 35-44.—The examination of the suspected house by the priest. First, the house is to be emptied of its furniture, lest the latter should contract a ceremonial uncleanness in case the house were found to be leprous, but not, it will be noted, lest it should convey contagion or infection. Then the priest is to examine the discolouration, and if it bear a suspicious appearance, the house is to be shut up for seven days. It is at the end of that time the spot has spread, he is to have the part of the wall in which it shows itself taken down and carried away, and built up again with new stones and mortar and plaster, the parts adjoining to the infected place having been first well scraped. If this treatment does not succeed in getting rid of the mischief, the priest is to determine that it is a *fretting leprosy* in the house: it is unclean.

Ver. 45.—As the leper was removed from the camp, so the leprous house is to be utterly pulled down; the house, the stones of it, and the timber thereof, and all the mortar of the house; and all its materials carried forth out of the city into an unclean place.

Vera. 46, 47.—The leprous house conveys uncleanness to those that enter it, but of so slight a nature that it ceases with the evening, and requires only that the clothes of the wearer be washed. Such a regulation would have been ineffectual for preventing the spread of infection, if that had been its purpose.

Vera. 48-53.—The ceremony of cleansing the house is as similar to that of cleansing the leper as circumstances will permit. In case there is no reappearance of the mischief after the new stones and plastering have been put in, the priest shall pronounce the house clean, because the plague is healed. First, the priest assures himself that the plague is healed, then he pronounces the house clean, and still after that the cleansing is to take place (cf. vers. 3, 7, 8). The

cleansing is effected by the same ceremony as that of the leper himself, by the two birds, and cedar wood, and scarlet, and hyssop. The use of this ceremony in the cleansing of a house shows that, in the case of the leper, the symbolical meaning of letting go the living bird out of the city into the open fields cannot be, as has been maintained, the restoration of the cleansed man to his natural movements of liberty in the camp. If a bird's flight represents the freedom of a man going hither and thither as he will, it certainly does not represent any action that a house could take.

Vera. 54-57.—These verses contain the concluding formula for chs. xiii., xiv. The various names of leprosy and its kindred diseases are resumed from ch. xiii. 2.

#### HOMILETICS.

Vers. 33-53.—*On uncleanness in houses.* There are two metaphors commonly used in Holy Scripture for designating God's covenant people. They are (1) God's household; (2) God's house.

I. God's HOUSEHOLD. As the household of God the Father, "of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named" (Eph. iii. 15), they are the members of that august brotherhood gathered together in Christ, of which God himself is the spiritual Father, into which all that are adopted in Christ are incorporated, ceasing to be "strangers and foreigners," and becoming "fellow-citizens with the saints and of the household of God" (Eph. ii. 19).

II. God's HOUSE. The representation that God's people form his house is of a more singular character, and less capable of being immediately grasped. It is even more commonly employed than the other. In the Epistle to the Corinthians, we read of Christians, that is, the collective body of Christians, being "God's temple" (1 Cor. iii. 16); "for ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people" (2 Cor. vi. 16). In the Epistle to the Ephesians, St. Paul dwells at length on the idea of the Christian Church being built up of living stones into a temple for God's Spirit: "Ye are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ being himself the chief corner stone; in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord: in whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit" (Eph. ii. 20-22). And in the Epistle to Timothy, he speaks of "the house of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth" (1 Tim. iii. 15). Similarly, the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, having described Christ "as a Son over his own house," continues, "whose house are we" (Heb. iii. 6); and St. Peter writes, "Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house" (1 Pet. ii. 3). Just as God's Spirit dwells within the heart of each individual Christian, so, and in a more special manner, he dwells within the Church, his house not being made by hands, or constituted of wood and stone, but of the spirits of those who form the Church.

III. God's HOUSE MAY NEVER BE DESTROYED, BUT IT MAY BE DEFILED. "Upon this rock" (that is, upon himself as confessed by St. Peter), "I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it" (Matt. xvi. 18). But though not destructible by the power of evil, it may yet be defiled. "If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are" (1 Cor. iii. 17). That which defiles God's house is unrighteousness and falsehood, just as physical and ceremonial uncleanness defiles the camp (Deut. xxiii. 12). If the latter be allowed to continue in the camp, God will symbolically "turn away" from

it ; "for the Lord thy God walketh in the midst of the camp, to deliver thee, and to give up thine enemies before thee ; therefore shall thy camp be holy : that he see no unclean thing in thee, and turn away from thee" (Deut. xxiii. 14). If the former be found, "the Holy Spirit of God" will be "grieved" (Eph. iv. 30), and " vexed," so that God is turned into an "enemy" (Isa. lxiii. 10).

IV. THE CLEANSING OF GOD'S HOUSE. As soon as there is a *prima facie* appearance of immorality, or irreligiousness, or superstition in a National Church, a diligent examination should be made by those placed in authority by God. Perhaps it is only an appearance, which will die away of itself. If it does so, no further measures are needed. But "*if the plague spread in the walls of the house ; then the priest shall command that they take away the stones in which the plague is, and they shall cast them into an unclean place without the city : and he shall cause the house to be scraped within round about, and they shall pour out the dust that they scrape off without the city into an unclean place.*" Those whose office it is, must not shrink from removing the stones in which the mischief is found, that is, of casting out those who are incurably affected with irreligion, immorality, or superstition. "*And they shall take other stones, and put them in the place of those stones ; and he shall take other mortar, and shall plaster the house.*" Discipline must be exercised by substituting sound teachers and members of the flock for those that have become unsound. This is the work of reformation. This is what was done for the Jewish Church by Joash, when he "was minded to repair the house of the Lord. . . . So the workmen wrought, and the work was perfected by them, and they set the house of God in his state, and strengthened it" (2 Chron. xxiv. 4—13) ; and by Hezekiah, when he said unto the Levites, "Sanctify now yourselves, and sanctify the house of the Lord God of your fathers, and carry forth the filthiness out of the holy place. For our fathers have trespassed, and done that which was evil in the eyes of the Lord our God, and have forsaken him. . . . And the priests went into the inner part of the house of the Lord, to cleanse it, and brought out all the uncleanness that they found in the temple of the Lord into the court of the house of the Lord. And the Levites took it, to carry it out abroad into the brook Kidron" (2 Chron. xxix. 5—16) ; and by Josiah, when "he began to purge Judah and Jerusalem . . . when he had purged the land and the house he sent . . . to repair the house of the Lord his God . . . and they gave the money to the workmen that wrought in the house of the Lord, to repair and amend the house : even to the artificers and builders gave they it, to buy hewn stone, and timber for couplings, and to floor the houses which the king of Judah had destroyed" (2 Chron. xxxiv. 3—11). And this is what was done for the greater part of the Christian Church in the West in the sixteenth century. But if these measures prove ineffective, "*if the plague come again, and break out in the house, after that he hath taken away the stones, and after he hath scraped the house and after it is plastered ; then the priest shall come and look, and, behold, if the plague be spread in the house, it is a fretting leprosy in the house : it is unclean. And he shall break down the house, the stones of it, and the timber thereof, and all the mortar of the house ; and he shall carry them forth out of the city into an unclean place.*" So it was with the Jewish Church. The reformations of Joash, of Hezekiah, of Josiah, were ineffectual, and the Babylonian captivity followed. And so it will be with the various National Churches of Christendom : any one of them to which the taint of impurity in life or doctrine obstinately adheres, will be destroyed utterly when God's forbearance shall have at length come to an end.

V. WARNING. "Remember therefore from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do the first works ; or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will remove thy candlestick out of his place, except thou repent" (Rev. ii. 5). "Repent ; or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will fight against them with the sword of my mouth" (Rev. ii. 16). "Remember therefore how thou hast received and heard, and hold fast, and repent. If therefore thou shalt not watch, I will come on thee as a thief, and thou shalt not know what hour I will come upon thee" (Rev. iii. 3). "As many as I love, I rebuke and chasten : be zealous therefore, and repent. Behold, I stand at the door, and knock : if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me" (Rev. iii. 19, 20).

## HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

Vers. 33-53.—*Cleansing the corrupt house.* That the Divine Lawgiver should, in this tabernacle period of Israel's history, anticipate a time when their future houses would be affected by some disorder similar to leprosy in the human skin, and that he should direct a treatment of such houses closely corresponding with that of the human leper, is exceedingly remarkable. Nothing could possibly impress the Hebrew mind more powerfully with the idea that "the face of the Lord was against" that spiritual evil of which leprosy was the chosen type. How direct the argument and forcible the conclusion that, if not only every remotest particle of leprosy itself was to be ruthlessly put away but also anything which to the bodily eye had even a near resemblance to it, and was thus suggestive of it,—how offensive, how intolerable, in the sight of God must that evil thing itself be held! Here are—

I. THREE MAIN PRINCIPLES ON THE SUBJECT OF CORRUPTION. In God's view, as we gain it from his Word, 1. Corruption (impurity) may attach to the "house" or community as well as to the individual. We read of "the iniquity of the house of Israel," and of "the iniquity of the house of Judah" (Ezek. iv. 5, 6); of "the house of Israel dealing treacherously with God" (Jer. iii. 20), etc. 2. That earnest effort should be made to cleanse it from corruption. The leprous house of stone was to be cleansed: the stones in which the plague was were to be taken away (ver. 40); the house was to be scraped round about, and its unclean dust cast out of the camp (ver. 41); other stones were to be placed and other mortar used instead (ver. 42); the leprous part was to be removed and the house renovated. So must the contaminated community purify itself, removing that from it which is evil and corrupting—its Achan, its Ananias and Sapphira, its Simon the sorcerer, its guilty member (1 Cor. v.), etc. 3. That, all efforts failing, the house will be destroyed. "He shall break down the house, the stones of it," etc. (ver. 45). A community of any kind that is incurably corrupt (1) had better be broken up deliberately by the hand of man; but if not (2), will certainly be dissolved in time by the hand of God. The history of the world abounds in proofs that moral and spiritual corruption lead on to feebleness, decay, dissolution.

II. THREE MAIN APPLICATIONS OF THE PRINCIPLES. To any leprous "house," to any community into which seeds of corruption have been introduced, these principles will apply. They may with peculiar appropriateness be referred to: 1. *The nation.* The "house of Judah" and the "house of Israel" were continually warned that they had erred from the ways of the Lord and become corrupt, that they must cleanse themselves from their impurities, or that they would be abandoned by God to their doom. Assyria, Judea, Egypt, Greece, Rome, the Ottoman Empire, provide striking and eloquent illustrations. 2. *The family.* The "house of Eli" and the "house of Saul" illustrate the principles of the text; so also many a "house" in Christian times that has risen to honour and influence, that has grown leprous (corrupt), that has not heeded the warnings of the Word of God to put away the evil of its doings, and that has fallen into decay and has disappeared. 3. *The Church.* This is the "house of God" on earth (1 Tim. iii. 15; 2 Tim. ii. 20; Eph. ii. 19; Heb. iii. 6). This house may show signs of leprosy; and in individual Churches corruption may break out—in *doctrine* (Galatia), in *public worship* (Corinth), in *moral*s (Pergamos, Thyatira), in *spiritual life* (Ephesus, Sardis, Laodicea). The corrupt Church must be cleansed, or it will be disowned of the Divine Lord, and it will perish in his high displeasure (Rev. ii. 5, 16, 23, 27; iii. 3, 17-19).—O.

Vers. 33-57.—*Leprosy in a house.* From the first of these verses it is concluded that leprosy was not an ordinary disease, but a plague inflicted immediately by a judgment from God. That it was so inflicted in some instances upon persons cannot be disputed (see Numb. xii. 10; 2 Kings v. 27; xv. 5), and God threatens to curse the house of the wicked with such a plague (Zech. v. 4). The Jews view it in this light, and consequently regard leprosy as incurable except by the hand of God. But in

Scripture, what God *permits* is often represented as his *doing*; and evils that Satan inflicts may require the power of God to remove.

I. WHAT ARE WE TO UNDERSTAND BY THE HOUSE? 1. *There is the obvious literal meaning.* It is an ordinary habitation (differing, indeed, from the tents in which the Israelites sojourned in the wilderness), composed of stones, and mortar, and wood, and plaster. 2. *It must also have a moral interpretation.* (1) If in the person leprosy has a twofold meaning, viz. a literal and moral; and if the garment plagued with leprosy has a moral as well as a literal meaning, so, by parity of reason, must the house. (2) It cannot be supposed that for sanitary reasons simply the leprosy in the house should occupy the space it takes in the Scriptures. (3) Over and above the sanitary regulations, we find regulations for the ceremonial cleansing, in which are sacrifices and sprinklings, "to make an atonement for the house" (vers. 48—53). These in other cases are admitted to have reference to the provisions of the gospel for moral purposes, and therefore should be so considered here. 3. *It should be taken to represent a community.* (1) It is used sometimes to describe a *family*. Thus we read of the "house of Cornelius," and of Noah saving "his house" (Acts x. 2; Heb. xi. 7). (2) It is also used to express a *lineage*. Thus we read of a long war raging between the "house of Saul" and the "house of David" (2 Sam. iii. 1). (3) The larger community of a *nation* is called a "house." Thus we read repeatedly of the "house of Israel," the "house of Judah," and Egypt is spoken of as the "house of bondage" (Deut. viii. 14). (4) An ecclesiastical community is in like manner described as a house. Paul speaks of the "house of God, which is the Church of the living God" (1 Tim. iii. 15; see also Heb. iii. 2—6; x. 21; 1 Pet. iv. 17). 4. *A leprous house is a demoralized community.* (1) Thus a family of wicked persons, or in which are members scandalous for irreligion and vice, is morally a leprous house. Such was the house of Eli. (2) A lineage of wickedness also is a leprous house. Such was the house of "Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, who made Israel to sin." Such that of Omri. (3) A nation given to idolatry such as Israel became before the Assyrian captivity, and Judah before the Babylonish, may be regarded as a leprous house. So are modern nations demoralized by atheism, infidelity, sabbath desecration, drunkenness, and dissipation, leprous houses. (4) A Church holding out the poison cup of "damnable heresy" to intoxicate nations, encouraging vice by "indulgences," and "red" with the "blood of the saints and martyrs of Jesus," is a house fearfully smitten with the plague of leprosy.

II. WHAT TREATMENT SHOULD IT RECEIVE? 1. *The leprosy should be reported to the priest* (vers. 34, 35). (1) The Priest is Christ, to whom we must carry all our concerns in prayer—domestic, political, ecclesiastical. The voice of suffering cries to him for judgment upon oppressors (Jas. v. 4), and the voice from the ashes of the martyrs loudly imprecates judgment upon their persecutors (Rev. vi. 9—11). (2) Faithful ministers of Christ should be apprised of the symptoms of the plague of heresy or immorality, that they might use their good offices and influence to stop the mischief. (3) Any of the spiritual priesthood, persons of recognized sanctity and probity, might be informed of the spreading of moral leprosy, whether it be in the family, or State, or Church. 2. *Warning should be given to those concerned.* (1) The priest himself gives the warning. The premonitions of Jesus are written in his Word. It tells us of days of judgment upon nations, upon Churches, upon individuals. (2) Faithful ministers of Christ will utter his words. No false notions of "charity" will prevent them from sounding the alarm. (3) The use of the warning is to have everything removed from the leprous house before the priest's inquisition for judgment; for whatever he finds in the unclean house will be concluded to be unclean (see Rev. xviii. 4). 3. *It will be duly inspected.* (1) Christ moves in all communities, though unseen, and more particularly amongst the candlesticks, or Churches. His eyes are as flames of fire, searching into all secrets of the "reins and hearts" (Rev. i. 12—16, 23). (2) The light of God's Word should be let in to discover the heresy that may plague any Church, and to rebuke the laxity of discipline which may connive at licentiousness (Rev. ii. 14—16, 20—23). 4. *It will be shut up for seven days.* (1) The priest himself withdraws. Jesus cannot abide in a foul community. (2) Whoever enters it during this interval becomes unclean (ver. 46). Where Jesus cannot abide, his people should not go. (3) He that lieth in the house or eateth in it shall wash his clothes

(ver. 47). Fellowship in such a community compromises righteousness. What is the condition of those who are perverted to heresy ! 5. *Efforts towards a reformation should be made.* (1) Where the plague may appear superficial, the place must be scraped ; where it has eaten deeply, the stones affected must be removed and new ones substituted, and the whole plastered afresh. (2) However painful the process, the scraping of discipline must be endured (Job xxii. 23). There must be an excision of scandalous offenders (1 Cor. v. 13). 6. *The sequel.* (1) If the plague remain through the days of trial, breaking out afresh, notwithstanding the efforts for reformation, when the case is hopeless, then comes the visitation of judgment. The house is demolished and the wreck carried outside the city to an unclean place (see Rev. xxii. 15). (2) If the reformation has proved successful, the house abides. The ceremonies of the shedding and sprinkling the sacrificial blood (vers. 48-53) show that salvation is through faith in the merits of Christ. To those merits we are indebted for a present and an everlasting salvation.—J. A. M.

### EXPOSITION.

#### CHAPTER XV.

**RUNNING ISSUES FROM THE HUMAN BODY.** These are the fourth cause of ceremonial uncleanness. We are not to look for a moral basis for the regulation on account of any vicious habit connected with such issues. They are foul and repulsive, and simply for that reason they are causes of ceremonial uncleanness to those who suffer from them, and to those who come in contact with persons suffering from them.

**Vers. 2-15.**—The first case of an issue. It appears to be identical with the disease called by physicians gonorrhea, or, perhaps, blenorhoea (cf. ch. xxii. 4; Numb. v. 2).

**Vers. 16, 17.**—The second case of an issue (cf. ch. xxii. 4; Deut. xxiiii. 10; Gen. xxviii. 9, 10).

**Vers. 18.**—The third case of an issue (cf. Exod. xix. 15; 1 Sam. xxi. 5; 1 Cor. vii. 5).

**Vers. 19-24.**—The fourth case of an

issue—that of ordinary menstruation (cf. chs. xii. 2; xx. 18).

**Vers. 25-30.**—The fifth case of an issue—that of excessive menstruation, or menstruation occurring at the wrong time. This was probably the disease of the woman "who had an issue of blood" (Matt. ix. 20; Mark v. 25; Luke viii. 43).

**Ver. 28.**—*If she be cleansed of her issue.* In the first and the fifth cases, the presentation of two turtle-doves or two young pigeons as a sin offering and a burnt offering is enjoined as the ceremonial cleansing required. In the other cases a sacrifice is not demanded.

**Ver. 31.**—*That they die not in their uncleanness, when they defile my tabernacle that is among them.* The main purpose in the laws of uncleanness is to keep first God's house and then God's people free from the danger of defilement by foul things presenting themselves freely before him and among them. These foul things, symbolizing sinful things, create a ceremonial defilement symbolizing moral defilement.

### HOMILETICS.

**Ver. 25.**—*The figure of the "woman which was diseased with an issue of blood twelve years" seems to rise up before us as we read this verse.* Jesus was going on an errand of mercy to heal the daughter of Jairus, and as he went the people thronged him. "And a certain woman, which had an issue of blood twelve years, and had suffered many things of many physicians, and had spent all that she had, and was nothing bettered, but rather grew worse, when she had heard of Jesus, came in the press behind, and touched his garment" (Mark v. 25-27).

**I. THE WOMAN'S STATE OF CEREMONIAL UNCLEANNESS.** For twelve years she had not been allowed within the precincts of the temple, and had been unable, therefore, to take part in the public worship of God as appointed in the books of Moses. And during the whole of the same long period she had been in a state of separation from all about her: whoever touched her became unclean ; the bed she lay upon was unclean ; the seats that she sat upon were unclean ; whoever touched the bed that she lay upon or the seat that she sat upon was unclean. No wonder if for this reason alone "she had spent all her living upon physicians" (Luke viii. 43).

II. HER STATE OF PHYSICAL SUFFERING. She was afflicted with an exhausting disease, wasting her vital powers, and she suffered not only from that cause, but also from the vain attempts made by many physicians to relieve her, as well as from the anxiety of mind inseparable from her state of ceremonial impurity.

III. WHAT SHE SOUGHT. Not to be cleansed as by a priest—this could not be until she had been cured—but to be healed as by a physician. “For she said, If I may touch but his clothes, I shall be whole” (Mark v. 28). The Great Physician accepts her, and fulfils her desire; for however imperfect her faith might be, and however uninstructed she might herself be, yet there was faith in her sufficient “to make her whole” (Matt. ix. 22).

IV. HOW THE HEALING WAS WROUGHT. The cure was effected by the power of Christ conveyed through the touch of his garment, on the condition of the woman’s faith. In each of the miracles he uses such means as he thinks fit, and often different means, probably with the purpose in each case of awaking the spirit of the person to be healed so as to become capable of receiving the spiritual gift. As in the case of the lepers on whom he laid his hand, instead of becoming himself unclean, he becomes the channel of renewed life and health to those whom he touches.

V. THE CEREMONIAL CLEANSING STILL TO BE EFFECTED. As the leper, after he had been healed by our Lord, had to “go and show himself to the priest, and offer the gift that Moses commanded” (Matt. viii. 4), so no doubt the woman cured of the issue of blood had to fulfil the legal requirement for her cleansing, by offering her sin offering and her burnt offering on the eighth day after her healing.

VI. SPIRITUAL APPLICATION OF THE MIRACLE. Sin can only be healed by the power of God through Christ brought into spiritual contact with the soul of the sinner, and there must be something of faith and love in the heart of the sinner, however imperfect its manifestation may be, in order that that spiritual contact between God’s Spirit and his spirit may take place.

#### HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

*Secret sins.* Ch. xv.; cf. Ps. xix. 12; 1 Tim. i. 13. We have already had occasion to discern as a clear lesson of the old ritual that *sin is a nature*. The old law did not confine itself to overt acts, but insisted on “sins of ignorance” being regarded as elements of guilt (cf. ch. iv.). Then again we have sin shown to originate in birth (ch. xii.); we have its tangible effects strikingly illustrated in the law of the leprosy (chs. xiii., xiv.); and now we have the analysis of sin completed in these laws about issues.

I. IT IS A PHYSICAL FACT THAT MEN AND WOMEN MAY BECOME UNCLEAN WITHOUT ANY ACT OF VOLITION ON THEIR PART. Into the particulars of menstruation and of *gonorrhœa benigna* it is unnecessary to enter. The chapter before us states the fact, and asserts the legal uncleanness which is thereby entailed. If involuntary results entail uncleanness, it is clear that voluntary elements entering in (ver. 18) must increase the sense of uncleanness. Experience confirms the Divine decision. There is a sense of uncleanness which arises as soon as the man or woman becomes conscious of the issue.

II. IT IS EVIDENT FROM THIS THAT SIN HAS A SPHERE OF OPERATION BEYOND CONSCIOUS VOLITION. Just as physically a man or woman contracts uncleanness during the unconsciousness of sleep, so morally we find sinful issues coming forth from the evil heart and nature ere ever we are aware. In strict conformity with this fact, Jonathan Edwards was accustomed to analyze his dreams, believing that, in these involuntary movements of the mind, the moral tendencies of the indwelling spirit may often be detected, and by greater watchfulness subdued. “No mind,” says Dr. Shedd, “that thinks at all upon sin can possibly stop with the outward act. Its own rational reflection hurries it away, almost instantaneously, from the blow of the murderer—from the momentary gleam of the knife—to the *volition* within that struck the muscle and nerved the blow. But the mind cannot stop here in its search for the essential reality of sin. When we have reached the sphere—the *inward* sphere—of volitions, we have by no means reached the ultimate ground and form of sin. We may suppose that because we have gone beyond the outward act—because we are now *within* the

man—we have found sin in its last form. But we are mistaken. Closer thinking, and what is still better, a deeper experience, will disclose to us a depth in our souls lower than that in which volitions occur, and a form of sin in that depth, and to the bottom of it, very different from the sin of single volitions. The thinking mind which cannot stop with mere effects, but seeks for first causes, and especially the heart that knows its own plague, cannot stop with that quite superficial action of the will which manifests itself in a volition. The action is too isolated—too intermittent—and, in reality, too feeble, to account for so steady and uniform a state of character as human sinfulness. For these particular volitions, ending in particular outward actions, the mind instinctively seeks a common ground. For these innumerable volitions, occurring each by itself and separately, the mind instinctively seeks *one single indivisible nature* from which they spring. When the mind has got back to this point, it stops content, because it has reached a central point." This most important truth, then, is most powerfully presented by this law regarding issues. We are held responsible for much more than the voluntary element in life.

III. THE FRUITLESSNESS OF THESE OUTCOMES OF NATURE SHOULD ALSO RECEIVE A PASSING NOTICE. The issues spoken of in this chapter are, with one exception, fruitless issues. In no plainer way could the fruitless issues of man's evil nature be illustrated. If "out of the heart are the issues of life," out of man's evil heart of unbelief are issues of fruitlessness and death.

IV. FOR THESE UNCLEANNESES, INVOLUNTARY AND SECRET, GOD PROVIDED A FITTING ATONEMENT. It is very noticeable that, while the reality of the guilt in these cases is made manifest, it is the smallest sacrifice, two turtle-doves, or two young pigeons, which God requires. There is no exaggeration in dealing with the secret sins. Done in ignorance, they are not placed upon the same level with voluntary transgressions. At the same time, they are not winked at.

The sin offering is, of course, a type of Christ, our Atoning Sacrifice. It is on the ground of his atonement that we ask cleansing from secret faults (Ps. xix. 12) as well as from conscious transgressions. In truth, we are encouraged to come and to acknowledge that sin is a much larger matter than we are conscious of, that, in fact, it goes beyond all our conceptions, but at the same time is within the reach and grasp of our Lord's atoning power. If he thus sets our secret sins in the light of his countenance, it is that he may have them entirely removed. Saul may have committed his sins of persecution ignorantly in unbelief, but he needs to obtain mercy on account of them (1 Tim. ii. 13). Superficial views of sin would lead men to imagine that a sin done in ignorance is not a guilty thing. God thinks differently, because he looks into the heart and discerns the deep-seated source.

The burnt offering was to express the renewed sense of consecration which the cleansing brings. Out of defilement the soul passes, by Divine grace, into devotion.

The whole analysis of sin in these chapters (xiii.—xv.) is profound and philosophical. In fact, portions of Scripture apparently repulsive become replete with wholesome truth when handled humbly and reverently.—R. M. E.

Vers. 1—33.—*Uncleanness.* Had sin never entered, there had been no disease. Diseases are consequences of sin; their symptoms are therefore taken as emblems of it. So when our Lord miraculously "healed all manner of sickness, and all manner of disease," he evinced ability to remove all corresponding moral evil. The examples specified in the Law are typical or representative, and are such as have symptoms pronounced and visible.

I. THOSE WHO HAD ISSUES IN THE FLESH WERE UNCLEAN. 1. *Out of a pure heart are the issues of life* (see Prov. iv. 23). (1) The blood, which is the life of the flesh, issuing from the heart, passes along the arteries to the extremities of the body, and carries nourishment to every part. (2) This is a fine emblem of the heart of the "good treasure," whose influence upon any corporation, whether domestic, civic, or ecclesiastic, is life-giving (Luke vi. 45). But: 2. *Out of a foul heart are the issues of death.* (1) If the blood is poisoned at its source, the poison is carried to the extremities, and will break out in ulcers and purulent issues. (2) As these symptoms declare the biddeness of the blood at the heart, which, if not purified, must terminate in mortification and death, so are they appropriate emblems of moral impurity (see Matt. xii. 34, 35;

Mark. vii. 20—23; Jas. i. 21). (3) Or if the blood, which is the life, flow away from the body, that also is a fitting emblem of sin which is spiritual death. Therefore the woman who has an issue of blood is accounted unclean, as being in that condition in which the streams of the fountain of life are diverted from their uses of health and nourishment. Those who reject the life-giving efficacy of the gospel are morally dead, and must, if they remain so, rot in their iniquities (see Lam. i. 9, 17; Ezek. xxxvi. 17). 3. *The Law enjoined the separation of the unclean.* (1) They must not come into the tabernacle. They are unfit to stand in God's presence or to mingle with his people. They must not eat of the holy things. They are in no moral condition to hold fellowship with God and his Church (see Ps. xxiv. 4; Matt. v. 8). (2) They have to remove outside the camp, like the leper (see Numb. v. 2, 3). There they must remain until they are healed and cleansed. (3) They transgress these bounds at their peril. They may be stoned to death by the people, or God himself may deal with them (ver. 31; Exod. xix. 12, 13). The profane under the gospel have a "much sorer punishment" (see Heb. x. 26—31).

II. THEY RENDERED UNCLEAN WHATEVER THEY TOUCHED. 1. *This signified the contagion of sin.* (1) Persons were rendered unclean by contact with them (vers. 7, 19, 26). We cannot have fellowship with sin and with God (1 Cor. v. 11; xv. 33; 2 Cor. vi. 15—18; Eph. iv. 29; Jas. iv. 4). (2) Things touched by them were also rendered unclean. The bed, the chair, the saddle, etc. (vers. 4, 12, 20). These things may represent men in their properties or attributes, or in their usages, which are all damaged by the influence of sin (1 Thess. iv. 4). (3) Those who touched things rendered unclean by contact, also became unclean (vers. 5, 6, 21—23). What a picture of the spreading power of evil example! How careful should we be to save ourselves from the untoward generation! 2. *Even when cured they must be cleansed.* (1) Genuine repentance may cure sinful habits, but does not cancel guilt nor purify from sin. The utmost it could do is to prevent accumulations of guilt; the old score remains to be dealt with. It does not touch the depravity of the heart (see Matt. xxiii. 25). (2) Time is given to test the cure. Where the disease was rooted, "seven days" of quarantine were required (see vers. 13, 24, 28). The repentance of a moment after a life of evil habits may prove illusive. (3) Where no disease existed, but uncleanness was contracted by contact, the quarantine was "until the even." The time here indicated was that of the evening sacrifice, which pointed significantly to the evening of the Jewish day, otherwise called the "end of the world" or age, viz. when Jesus "appeared to put away sin [sacrifices] by the sacrifice of himself," and remove ritual obligations. 3. *Observe the ceremonies of cleansing.* (1) Some who were made clean by contact had to wash their hands (ver. 11; comp. Luke xi. 38—41). This was when they were *passive* when the contact was inflicted. But if *they* neglected to rinse their hands, then they were as though they were *active*, so they had to wash their flesh and their clothes, and be unclean until the even. No special sacrifices were prescribed. They availed themselves of the daily sacrifice ever on the altar. So in our contact with the moral filth of this world, which is often unavoidable, we have the fountain of the house of David ever flowing, to enable us, almost without an interruption, to walk in the light (see 2 Cor. vii. 1; 1 John i. 7; comp. John xiii. 10). (2) The person healed of an issue had to bathe his flesh and wash his clothes on the seventh day, when he became "clean." So far he cleansed *himself*. The spirit of the Law was fulfilled thus far if he put away all his evil ways (see Isa. i. 16; Matt. xv. 20; Jas. iv. 8). He was clean so far as repentance could make him so, which was *externally* only, or before his fellow-men. (3) He still needed the removal of sin from his *soul*. He had, therefore, now on the eighth day, to bring his sin offering and burnt offering, that with these the priest should "make an atonement for him before the Lord for his issue" (vers. 14, 15, 29, 30). Christ is the Healer and Cleanser (comp. Matt. viii. 16, 17, with Isa. liii. 4, 5).—J. A. M.

Vers. 1—33.—*Personal purity.* It is not permissible to treat this chapter in any detail; to do so would be to act inconsistently with the very object of the legislation, viz., the encouragement of all delicacy of thought as well as propriety of conduct. But the fact that such a chapter as this (with others like it) is found in Scripture is suggestive and instructive. We gather—

I. THAT PERSONAL PURITY WAS AND IS A MATTER OF THE VERY GREATEST CONSEQUENCE IN THE SIGHT OF GOD. Into the relation of the sexes, and into the thoughts, words, and actions which belong to that relation, sin has introduced confusion and degradation. That which should have been the source of nothing but pure and holy joy has become the ground on which the very worst and most debasing consequences of sin are exhibited. Save, perhaps, in some phases of heathen idolatry, there is nothing in which man has shown so grievous a departure from the will of God, and so pitiful a spectacle of uttermost degradation, as in the realm of the sexual relations. It was the design of the Holy One of Israel to train for himself a people which should be free from the flagitious and abominable corruption into which the heathen nations had sunk. But he desired to go further than this: to promote and foster, by careful legislation, not only (1) morality in its more general sense, but also (2) decency of behaviour, and even (3) delicacy of thought. The Jews were taught and trained to put far away from them everything that was unclean. With this view it was made unlawful not only for those who had knowingly violated moral laws, but for those who had unwittingly offended the laws of ceremonial cleanliness, to draw near to their God or to their fellows.

II. THAT SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS THEREON ARE A MATTER OF HOLY EXPEDIENCY. It was needful that the children of Israel should receive particular and precise instructions, for they were to be separated from all surrounding nations in their customs, and so in their character—notably in this matter of purity. Moreover, they were admitted to the near presence of God, and must therefore be clear of all impurity; death would be the penalty of defiling the tabernacle of God (ver. 31). Special admonitions and special care are needed: 1. In the case of those who are placed in circumstances of peculiar delicacy. 2. In the case of those who are bound to be above all suspicion of any kind of indelicacy. 3. In the case of the young, who may be led into evil, the magnitude and consequences of which they cannot know. Parental warning, wisely and timely given, may save sons and daughters from much bodily mischief and spiritual suffering.

III. THAT, IN THIS MATTER, WE MUST CONSIDER WHAT IS DUE, NOT ONLY TO OURSELVES, BUT TO OTHERS ALSO. All those details of Divine precept, by which every person and article anywise brought into contact with the unclean man or woman (vers. 4—12, 20—24, 26—27) became unclean, bring out the important truth that impurity is an essentially communicable evil. It is so physically; “let sinners look to it.” It is so spiritually. How guilty in the very last degree are those who drive a nefarious trade in corrupt literature! How shameful to put indecent thought into print to pollute the young! How demoralizing to the soul, how displeasing to God, how scrupulously to be avoided, the questionable conversation that borders on the indelicate and impure (Eph. v. 8, 4, 12; Col. iii. 8)!—C.

## PART III.

### SECTION II.

#### EXPOSITION.

##### CHAPTER XVI.

THE CEREMONIAL PURIFICATION OF THE WHOLE CONGREGATION ON THE GREAT DAY OF ATONEMENT. This chapter, containing the account of the institution of the ceremonial to be used on the Day of Atonement, would take its place chronologically immediately after the tenth chapter, for the instructions conveyed in it were delivered to Moses “after the death of the two sons of Aaron, when they offered before

*the Lord and died*” (ver. 1), when the fate of Nadab and Abihu would naturally have led Aaron to desire a more perfect knowledge than had as yet been imparted to him as to the manner in which he was to present himself before the Lord. Logically it might either occupy its present position, as being the great and culminating atoning and cleansing ceremony, or it might be relegated to a place among the holy days in ch. xxiii., where it is, in fact, shortly noticed. That it is placed here shows that

the most essential characteristic of the Day in the judgment of the legislator is that of its serving as the occasion and the means of “*making an atonement for the holy sanctuary, and making an atonement for the tabernacle of the congregation, and for the altar, and for making an atonement for the priests, and for all the people of the congregation*” (ver. 33).

Annually there gathered over the camp, and over the sanctuary as situated in the midst of the camp, a mass of defilement, arising in part from sins whose guilt had not been removed by the punishment of the offenders, and in part from uncleannesses which had not been cleansed by sacrifices and the prescribed ceremonial rites. Annually this defilement had to be atoned for or covered away from the sight of God. This was done by the solemn observance of the great Day of Atonement, and specially by the high priest’s carrying the blood of the sacrifice into the holy of holies, into which he might enter on no other day of the year; while the consciousness of deliverance from the guilt of sin was quickened on the part of the people by their seeing the scapegoat “*bear away upon him all their iniquities unto a land not inhabited*” (ver. 22).

Ver. 2.—*Speak unto Aaron thy brother, that he come not at all times into the holy place within the vail before the mercy seat, which is upon the ark; that he die not, Nadab and Abihu having died for their rash presumption in venturing unbidden into the tabernacle, it was natural that Aaron, who had as yet but once penetrated into the holy of holies, should be struck with fear, and that he should desire Divine instruction as to the times and manner in which he was to appear before the Lord, lest he should be struck dead like his sons. If the attempt to enter the outer chamber of the tabernacle had been so fatal to them, what might not be the result to him of entering *within the vail which hung before the mercy-seat which is upon the ark?* The mercy-seat—*capporeth, θαυτηπορ, propitiatorium*—formed the top of the ark, and was the place where God specially exhibited his Presence, on the occasions of his manifestation, by the bright cloud which then rested upon it between the cherubim. It was this Presence which made it perilous for Aaron to appear within the vail unbidden or without the becoming ritual; for man might not meet God unless he were sanctified for the purpose (Exod. xix. 14, 21—24; 1 Sam. vi. 19). The words, for I will appear in the cloud upon the mercy seat, refer to the Divine Presence*

thus visibly manifested (see 1 Kings viii. 10—12), and not, as they have strangely been misinterpreted, to the cloud of smoke raised by the incense burnt by the high priest on his entrance. They do not, however, prove that the manifestation was constantly there, still less that it was continued, according to Jewish tradition, in later times. “The reason for the prohibition of Aaron’s entrance at his own pleasure, or without the expiatory blood of sacrifice, is to be found in the fact that the holiness communicated to the priest did not cancel the sin of his nature, but only covered it over for the performance of his official duties; and so long as the Law, which produced only the knowledge of sin, and not its forgiveness and removal, was not abolished by the complete atonement, the holy God was and remained to mortal and sinful man a consuming fire, before which no one could stand” (Keil).

Ver. 3.—*Thus shall Aaron come into the holy place.* “Thus” would be translated more literally by *With this.* He must come supplied with the specified offering, dressed in the appointed manner and using the ceremonial here designated. The efficacy of the acts of the high priest on this day and throughout his ministrations depended not upon his individual but on his official character, and on his obedience to the various commandments positively enjoined. Personal worthiness would not qualify him for his service, nor personal unworthiness hinder the effect of his liturgical acts (cf. Art. XXVI., ‘Of the Unworthiness of the Ministers, which hinders not the effect of the Sacrament’). Aaron’s special offerings for himself on this great day are to be a young bullock for a sin offering, and a ram for a burnt offering.

Ver. 4.—*His special garments for the occasion are the holy linen coat, . . . the linen breeches, . . . a linen girdle, . . . and the linen mitre.* In the original the definite article is not expressed. The reading should therefore be, *He shall put on a holy linen coat, and he shall have linen breeches upon his flesh, and shall be girded with a linen girdle, and with a linen mitre shall be attired.* The clothing was white from head to foot, differing therein from the dress of the ordinary priest, inasmuch as the sash or girdle of the latter was of variegated materials, and differing also in the shape of the mitre. The white clothing was not intended to symbolize humility and penitence, as some have thought, for white is not the colour in which penitents are naturally dressed. Rather it was symbolical of the purity and holiness which the ceremonies of the day symbolically effected, and which was specially needed to be exhibited in the person of the high priest. In the visions of Ezekiel and

Daniel, the angel of God is clothed in *linen* (Ezek. ix. 2, 3, 11; x. 2, 6, 7; Dan. x. 5; xii. 6, 7). And the colour of the angelic raiment is described in the Gospels as *white*: "his countenance was like lightning, and his raiment white as snow" (Matt. xxviii. 3); "they saw a young man sitting on the right side, clothed in a long white garment" (Mark xvi. 5); "two men stood by them in shining garments" (Luke xxiv. 4); she "seeth two angels in white sitting" (John xx. 12). So, too, the wife of the Lamb, in the Book of the Revelation, has it "granted to her that she should be arrayed in fine linen clean and white: for the fine linen is the righteousness of saints" (Rev. xix. 7, 8). The white linen dress of the high priest, therefore (which must have given the appearance of the English surplice tied in at the waist), was intended to symbolize the purity and brightness which forms the characteristic of angels and saints, and, above all, of the King of saints. "The white material of the dress which Aaron wore when performing the highest act of expiation under the Old Testament was a symbolical shadowing forth of the holiness and glory of the one perfect Mediator between God and man, who, being the radiation of the glory of God and the image of his nature, effected by himself the perfect cleansing away of our sin, and who, as the true High Priest, being holy, innocent, unspotted, and separate from sinners, entered once by his own blood into the holy place not made with hands, namely, into heaven itself, to appear before the face of God for us and obtain everlasting redemption (Heb. i. 3; vii. 26; ix. 12, 24)" (Keil). The symbolism of the *holy garments* as indicating holiness and purity, is strengthened by the command that Aaron is to wash his flesh in water, and so put them on.

The high priest's acts on this day, so far as they are recounted in this chapter, were the following. 1. He bathed. 2. He dressed himself in his white holy garments. 3. He offered or presented at the door of the tabernacle a bullock for a sin offering for himself and his house. 4. He presented at the same place two goats for a sin offering for the congregation. 5. He cast lots on the two goats, one of which was to be sacrificed, the other to be let go into the wilderness. 6. He sacrificed the bullock. 7. He passed from the court through the holy place into the holy of holies with a censer and incense, and filled the space beyond the veil with a cloud of smoke from the incense. 8. He returned to the court, and, taking some of the blood of the bullock, passed again within the veil, and there sprinkled the blood once on the front of the

mercy-seat and seven times before it. 9. He came out again into the court, and killed the goat on which the lot for sacrifice had fallen. 10. For the third time he entered the holy of holies, and went through the same process with the goat's blood as with the bullock's blood. 11. He purified the other part of the tabernacle, as he had purified the holy of holies, by sprinkling with the atoning blood, as before, and placing some of it on the horns of the altar of incense (Exod. xxx. 10). 12. He returned to the court, and placed the blood of the bullock and goat upon the horns of the altar of burnt sacrifice, and sprinkled it seven times. 13. He offered to God the remaining goat, laying his hands upon it, confessing and laying the sins of the people upon its head. 14. He consigned the goat to a man, whose business it was to conduct it to the border of the wilderness, and there release it. 15. He bathed and changed his linen vestments for his commonly worn high priest's dress. 16. He sacrificed, one after the other, the two rams as burnt offerings for himself and for the people. 17. He burnt the fat of the sin offerings upon the altar. 18. He took measures that the remainder of the sin offerings should be burnt without the camp. In Numb. xxix. 7-11, twelve sacrifices are commanded to be offered by the high priest on this day, namely, the morning and evening sacrifice; a burnt offering for the people, consisting of one young bullock, one ram (as already stated), and seven lambs; and one goat for a sin offering; so that in all there were fifteen sacrifices offered, besides the meat and drink offerings. The punctiliousness of the Jews in later times was not content that the ceremonies should begin on the day itself. Preparations commenced a full week previously. On the third day of the seventh month, the high priest moved from his house in the city into the temple, and he was twice sprinkled with the ashes of the red heifer, by way of precaution against defilement. He spent the week in practising and rehearsing, under the eye of some of the elders of the Sanhedrim, the various acts that he would have to perform on the great day, and on the night immediately preceding it he was not allowed to sleep. In case of his sudden death or disqualification, a substitute was appointed to fulfil his function.

Ver. 5.—And he shall take of the congregation of the children of Israel two kids of the goats. It was necessary that the sacrifice offered for a person or class of persons should be provided by the offerer or offerers. The *two kids of the goats*, or rather the *two he-goats*, constituted together but one *sin offering*. This is important for the understanding of the sequel.

Ver. 6.—And Aaron shall offer his bullock

... and make an atonement for himself, and for his house. The first step is an expiatory offering to reconcile the officiating priest and the remainder of the priestly house to God. This was necessary before his offerings for the people could be accepted. It indicates the defects inherent in a priest whose nature was only that of man, which is compassed about with infirmities. The offering here commanded is not the slaying, but the solemn presentation, of the bullock to the Lord. In after times the following form of confession was used by the high priest when he laid his hand upon the bullock:—"O Lord, I have committed iniquity; I have transgressed; I have sinned, I and my house. O Lord, I entreat thee, cover over the iniquities, the transgressions, and the sins which I have committed, transgressed, and sinned before thee, I and my house; even as it is written in the Law of Moses thy servant, 'For on that day will he cover over for you, to make you clean; from all your transgressions before the Lord ye shall be cleansed'" (Edersheim, 'Temple Service').

Vers. 7, 8.—It must be carefully noted that, as the two goats made one sin offering (ver. 5), so they are both presented before the Lord at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation. By this solemn presentation they became the Lord's, one as much as the other. After this, Aaron is to cast lots upon the two goats. The two goats, of the same size and appearance as far as possible, stood together near the entrance of the court. And by them was an urn containing two lots. These the high priest drew out at the same moment, placing one on the head of one goat, the other on the head of the other goat. According as the lot fell, one of the goats was taken and at once offered to the Lord, with a view to being shortly sacrificed; the other was appointed for a scapegoat, and reserved till the expiatory sacrifice had been made, when it too was offered to the Lord, and then sent away into the wilderness. After the lot had been chosen, the two goats were distinguished from each other by having a piece of scarlet cloth tied, the first round its neck, the second round its horn. One lot for the Lord, and the other lot for the scapegoat. The last word is in the original *la-azazel*, and being found only in this chapter, it has caused a great discrepancy of opinion among interpreters as to its meaning. It has been diversely regarded as a place, a person, a thing, and an abstraction. The first class of interpreters explain it as some district of the wilderness; the second understand by it an evil spirit; the third take it as a designation of the goat; the fourth translate it, "for removal." The first interpretation may be

summarily rejected. If a localized spot were meant, that spot would have been left behind by a people constantly on the move. The second hypothesis—that *azazel* was an evil spirit, or the evil spirit—has been embraced by so considerable a number of modern expositors, that it is necessary to dwell upon it at some length. But, indeed, it has little to recommend it. It has been argued that *azazel* must be a proper name, because it has no article prefixed to it, *la-azazel*. This is a grammatical error. When a noun expresses an office or a function, and has the preposition *la* or *la* prefixed to it, it does not take an article in Hebrew any more than in French; e.g. in the verse, "Jehu . . . shalt thou anoint to be king (or for king) over Israel; and Elisha . . . shalt thou appoint to be prophet (or for prophet) in thy room" (1 Kings xix. 16), the Hebrew is *le-melek* and *le-nabi*, without the article. The same idiom will be found in 1 Sam. xxv. 30; 2 Sam. vii. 14. With greater plausibility it is argued that ver. 8 contrasts Jehovah and Azazel, and that if *la-Yehovah* be translated "for Jehovah," or "for the Lord," *la-azazel* must be translated "for Azazel." It may be allowed that there is a *prima facie* likelihood that, where words are thus contrasted, if one designates a person, the other would designate a person. But it is an incredibly rash assertion that this is always the case. All depends upon the idea which the speaker or writer has in his mind and desires to express. As part of the same argument, it is urged that the proposition, being the same in both clauses of the sentence, must be translated by the same word. This is certainly not the case. The natural meaning of *la* with a proper name is "for," and with a word expressing the performance of some function (technically called *nomen agentis*) it means "to be" (see the passage quoted above from 1 Kings xix. 16). Unless, therefore, *azazel* be a proper name (which has to be proved, not assumed) the preposition need not and ought not to be translated by "for" but by "to be." The word *la* is used with great latitude, and often in a different sense in the same sentence; e.g. Exod. xii. 24; ch. xxvi. 12. The objections to the theory that *azazel* means an evil spirit are of overwhelming force. It will be enough to name the following. 1. The name *azazel* is nowhere else mentioned. This could not be, if he were so important a being as to divide with Jehovah the sin offering of the congregation of Israel on the great Day of Atonement. 2. No suitable etymology can be discerned. The nearest approach to it is very forced—"the separated one." 3. The notion of appeasing, or bribing, or mocking the evil spirit by presenting to him a goat,

is altogether alien from the spirit of the rest of the Mosaic institutions. Where else is there anything like it? 4. The goat is presented and offered to Jehovah equally with the goat which is slain. To take that which has been offered (and therefore half sacrificed) to God and give it to Satan, would be a daring impiety, which is inconceivable. That *la-azazel* means "for removal" is the opinion of Bähr, Tholuck, Winer, and others. There is nothing objectionable in this interpretation, but the form of the word *azazel* points rather to an agent than to an abstract act. *Azazel* is a word softened (according to a not unusual custom) from *azazel*, just as *kokav* is a softened form of *kav-kav*, and as *Babel* is derived from *Babel* (Gen. xi. 9). *Azazel* is an active participle or participial noun, derived ultimately from *azal* (connected with the Arabic word *azala*, and meaning removed), but immediately from the reduplicate form of that verb, *azazel*. The reduplication of the consonants of the root in Hebrew and Arabic gives the force of repetition, so that while *azal* means removed, *azazel* means removed by a repetition of acts. *Azazel*, or *azazel*, therefore, means one who removes by a series of acts. "In this sense the word *azazel* is strictly expressive of the function which is ascribed to the scapegoat in ver. 21, 22; namely, that he 'be sent away, bearing upon him all the iniquities of the children of Israel into the wilderness.' It properly denotes one that removes or separates; yet a remover in such sort that the removal is not effected by a single act or at one moment, but by a series of minor acts tending to and issuing in a complete removal. No word could better express the movement of the goat before the eyes of the people, as it passed on, removing at each step, in a visible symbol, their sins further and further from them, until, by continued repetition of the movement, they were carried far away and removed utterly" (Sir W. Martin, 'Semitic Languages'). That it is the goat that is designated by the word *azazel* is the exposition of the LXX., Josephus, Symmachus, Aquila, Theodotion, the Vulgate, the Authorized English Version, and Luther's Version. The interpretation is founded on sound etymological grounds, it suits the context wherever the word occurs, it is consistent with the remaining ceremonial of the Day of Atonement, and it accords with the otherwise known religious beliefs and symbolical practices of the Israelites. The two goats were the single sin offering for the people; the one that was offered in sacrifice symbolized atonement or covering made by shedding of blood, the other symbolized the utter removal of the sins of the people,

which were conveyed away and lost in the depths of the wilderness, whence there was no return. Cf. Ps. ciii. 12, "As far as the east is from the west, so far hath he removed our transgressions from us;" and Micah vii. 19, "He will turn again, he will have compassion upon us; he will subdue our iniquities; and thou wilt cast all their sins into the depths of the sea." The eighth verse should be translated as it stands in the Authorized Version, or, if we ask for still greater exactness, *And Aaron shall cast lots upon the two goats; one lot for the Lord, and one lot for a remover of sins.*

Ver. 9, 10.—These verses might be translated as follows:—*And Aaron shall bring in the goat upon which the lot for the Lord fell, and shall offer him for a sin offering. But the goat, upon which fell the lot for a remover of sins, shall be presented alive before the Lord, to make an atonement with him, and to send him away for a remover of sins into the wilderness.* We are justified in inserting the words, "of sins," after "a remover," because "the use of the word *azal*, from which the word rendered by 'remover' is derived, is confined in the Hebrew dialect to the single purpose or institution which is here under consideration; so that this particular word must have been conveyed to the mind of a Hebrew hearer or reader this notion of a removal of sins, and none other" (Sir W. Martin, 'Semitic Languages'). The goat is both presented before the Lord, and subsequently (ver. 20) offered to him, the priest laying his hands upon him and making a confession of the sins of the people. After he has thus become the Lord's, how could he be given up to Satan? The purpose of his being set apart is to make an atonement with him (not *for him*, as some commentators explain it wrongly). As atonement was made by the blood of the sacrificed goat ceremonially covering sin, so it was also made by the live goat symbolically removing sin. But the atonement in both cases had reference to God. How could an atonement be made by an offering to Satan, unless Satan, not God, was the being whose wrath was to be propitiated, and with whom reconciliation was sought?

Ver. 11.—After having offered the bullock for his own sin offering, and presented the two goats, which constituted the sin offering of the people, and offered one of them, Aaron kills the bullock for the sin offering. A considerable interval had to elapse before he could make use of the bullock's blood for purposes of propitiation, and during this interval, occupied by his entrance into the holy of holies with the incense, the blood was held by an attendant, probably by one

of his sons, and prevented from coagulating by being kept in motion.

Vers. 12, 13.—This is the first entry of the high priest into the holy of holies. He takes with him a censer—literally, *the censer*, that is, the censer that he was to use on the occasion—full of burning coals of fire from off the altar; and his hands are full of sweet incense beaten small; his object being to fill the holy of holies with the smoke of the incense which may serve as at least a thin vail between himself and the Presence of the Lord, that he die not (cf. Exod. xxxiii. 20, “Thou canst not see my face: for there shall no man see me, and live;” cf. also Gen. xxxii. 30; Deut. v. 24; Judg. vi. 22; xiii. 22). Here we see taught the lesson of the vision of God, as he is, being impossible to the human faculties. He must be veiled in one way or another. After passing through the outer chamber of the tabernacle, the high priest found himself in the smaller chamber where stood the ark. Immediately he threw the incense on the coals of the censer, until the holy of holies was filled with the smoke, after which, according to later practice, he offered a prayer outside the vail. The following form of prayer, breathing, however, the spirit of ages long subsequent to the tabernacle, or even the first temple, is found in the Talmud:—“May it please thee, O Lord our God, the God of our fathers, that neither this day nor this year any captivity come upon us. Yet if captivity befall us this day or this year, let it be to a place where the Law is cultivated. May it please thee, O Lord our God, the God of our fathers, that want come not upon us this day or this year. But if want visit us this day or this year, let it be due to the liberality of our charitable deeds. May it please thee, O Lord, the God of our fathers, that this year may be a year of cheapness, of fulness, of intercourse and trade; a year with abundance of rain, of sunshine, and of dew; one in which thy people Israel shall not require assistance one from another. And listen not to the prayers of those who are about to set out on a journey (against rain). And as to thy people Israel, may no enemy exalt himself against them. May it please thee, O Lord our God, the God of our fathers, that the houses of the men of Saron (exposed to floods) may not become their graves” (Edersheim, ‘Temple Service’).

Ver. 14.—The second entry of the high priest into the holy of holies took place very soon after the first entry. Immediately that he had returned after lighting the incense, and perhaps offering a prayer, he took of the blood of the bullock, which he had previously killed, went back without delay, and sprinkled it with his finger upon

LEVITICUS.

the mercy seat eastward, that is, on the front of the ark beneath the Presence enthroned upon the mercy seat, and shrouded by the smoke of the incense; and before the mercy seat, that is, on the ground in front of it, he sprinkled of the blood with his finger seven times. In after times, when the ark was gone, the high priest sprinkled upwards once and downwards seven times.

Ver. 15.—The third entry was made as soon as he had killed the goat which formed a moiety of the sin offering of the congregation, when he brought his blood likewise within the vail, and did with that blood as he did with the blood of the bullock, sprinkling it the same number of times as before. “By the entrance of the high priest into the holy of holies is set forth that atonement could only be effected before the throne of Jehovah” (Clark).

Ver. 16.—The two sprinklings, first with the bullock’s blood, then with the goat’s blood, on the front of the ark and on the ground before it, effected the symbolical atonement which was required annually even for the holy of holies because it was pitched in the midst of sinful men. There remained the outer chamber of the tabernacle and the altar of burnt sacrifice to be atoned for. Accordingly, the high priest proceeds to do so for the tabernacle of the congregation, that is, to make a similar atonement by similar means outside the vail as he had made inside it. He would therefore have made one sprinkling with the blood upon the vail, and seven sprinklings before it, after which he placed the blood upon the horns of the altar of incense, according to the command given in Exod. xxx. 10. In later times it became customary also to sprinkle the top of the altar of incense seven times.

Ver. 17.—There shall be no man in the tabernacle of the congregation. From the first entry until the work of atonement was completed, both for the holy of holies and for the tabernacle, no one but the high priest was to be allowed within the door of the tabernacle, not only that there might be no witness of the withdrawal of the awful vail, but also that the rite of purification might not be interfered with by an impure presence. Even on the Day of Atonement the dwelling-place of God, typical of heaven, was closed to the eye and foot of man, “the way into the holiest of all being not yet made manifest” (Heb. ix. 8), until the Divine High Priest opened the way for his people by his own entrance.

Vers. 18, 19.—The holy of holies and the outer chamber of the tabernacle having been reconciled, the high priest shall go out unto the altar that is before the Lord—that is, the altar of burnt sacrifice in the court,

“

standing in front of the tabernacle, not the altar of incense, as has been supposed by some—and shall take of the blood of the bullock, and of the blood of the goat, and put it upon the horns of the altar round about. And he shall sprinkle of the blood upon it with his finger seven times. This completes the ceremony of “*making an atonement for the holy sanctuary, and making an atonement for the tabernacle of the congregation, and for the altar*” (ver. 33.)

Vers. 20, 21.—The second part of the ceremonies of the day now commences. It was not enough that the defilement of the sanctuary should be covered, and the sins of the priests and people atoned for by the blood of the sacrifices. There remained a consciousness of sin. How was this to be taken away? To effect this, Aaron proceeds to the unique ceremony of the day by which the utter removal of sin from the reconciled people is typified. He shall bring the live goat; this should be translated *offer the live goat*. It is the word used above for the *offering* of the goat that was slain, and it is the word always used for offering sacrifices to the Lord. The first goat had been offered in the usual manner, the offerer laying his hand on his head and perhaps praying over him. Now the second goat is offered, the high priest having to lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, . . . putting them upon the head of the goat. The confession of sins, at first extempore, would naturally, as time progressed, become stereotyped into a liturgical form, as it is found in the Mishna: “O Lord, they have committed iniquity; they have transgressed; they have sinned,—thy people, the house of Israel. O Lord, cover over, I entreat thee, their iniquities, their transgressions, and their sins, which they have wickedly committed, transgressed, and sinned before thee,—thy people, the house of Israel. As it is written in the Law of Moses thy servant, saying, ‘For on that day shall it be covered over for you, to make you clean; from all your sins before the Lord ye shall be cleansed’” (Edersheim, ‘Temple Service’). During this confession of sins the people remained prostrate in humiliation and prayer in the court of the tabernacle, and it was the custom of the high priest to turn towards them as he pronounced the last words, “Ye shall be cleansed.” At the conclusion of the confession, the high priest handed over the goat to a fit man, that is, to a man who was standing ready to take charge of him, and sent him away by his hand into the wilderness.

Ver. 22.—Then the goat went forth, bearing upon him all their iniquities. The slain goat had symbolized and ceremonially

wrought full atonement or covering of sins; but in order to impress upon the mind of the nation a joyful sense of entire liberation from the burden of sin, the second symbol of the disappearing goat is used; so that not only sin, but the consciousness and the fear of the taint and presence of sin, might be taken away from the cleansed and delivered people. The goat is to bear the iniquities of the people unto a land not inhabited. The latter words—in the original, *eretz gezerah*—would be more correctly translated, *a land cut off*, that is, completely isolated from the surrounding country by some barrier of rock or torrent, which would make it impossible for the goat to come back again. Thus the sins were utterly lost, as though they had never been, and they could not return to the sanctified people. The Hebrew word *gazar*, to cut (1 Kings iii. 25; Ps. xxxvi. 13), is represented in Arabic by *jazara*, and the substantive *gezerah* by *jazirah*, which means an island, or an area surrounded by rivers. The word is still in use in countries where Arabic is spoken, as the designation of a district divided from the neighbouring territories by rivers cutting it off, and making it a sort of island or peninsula. Into such a district as this, the man who led the goat was to let him go. In later times, contrary to the spirit of the Mosaic appointment, the goat was pushed over a projecting ledge of rock, and so killed, a device of man clumsily introduced for the purpose of perfecting a symbolism of Divine appointment. It was more in accordance with the original institution that “the arrival of the goat in the wilderness was immediately telegraphed by the waving of flags, from station to station, till a few minutes after its occurrence it was known in the temple, and whispered from ear to ear, that the goat had borne upon him all their iniquities into a land not inhabited” (Edersheim, ‘Temple Service’). Both the goat that was sacrificed and the goat that served as remover of sins typified Christ. The first presents him to our faith as the Victim on the cross, the other as the Sin-bearer on whom the Lord laid “the iniquity of us all” (Isa. liii. 4; cf. 2 Cor. v. 21; Gal. iii. 13). “The reason for making use of two animals is to be found purely in the physical impossibility of combining all features that had to be set forth in the sin offering in one animal” (Keil).

Vers. 23, 24.—In later times another scene was interposed at this point. The high priest, having sent away the man with the goat, recited the passages of Scripture which commanded the observance of the Day of Atonement (chs. xvi.; xxiii. 27-32; Numb. xxix. 7-11), and offered prayers in which the people might mentally join.

Then he went back into the tabernacle of the congregation (not into the holy of holies), and, as all the special atoning and purifying services of the day were now over, he there took off his linen dress, and put it away; and after bathing in the holy place, that is, in that part of the sanctuary set apart for that purpose, he put on his ordinary high-priestly garments, and sacrificed first a goat for a sin offering (Numb. xxix. 16), next his own burnt offering of a ram, and then the burnt offering of the people, which was also a ram and other victims (*Ibid.*).

Ver. 25.—After the flesh of the burnt sacrifice had been placed in order on the altar, the fat of the sin offering, that is, of the bullock (ver. 6) and of the goat (ver. 15) and of the other goat (Numb. xxix. 16), is placed upon it, and burnt upon the altar, according to the regular practice.

Ver. 26.—The man that let go the goat which served for a remover of sins is to wash his clothes, and bathe his flesh before he comes into the camp. This is not ordered on account of any special defilement attaching to the scapegoat, but only because it had been the symbolical sin-bearer, and therefore conveyed legal uncleanness by its touch. The man who bore the flesh of the other goat to be burnt had to do exactly the same thing (ver. 28).

Ver. 27, 28.—As the blood of the bullock and the goat which had been offered in the special expiatory sacrifices of the day had been carried within the sanctuary (vers. 14, 15), their bodies had to be burnt without the camp (ch. iv. 12). Our Lord being the antitype, not only of Aaron as the Great High Priest, but also of the expiatory sacrifices as the Great Sin Offering, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews notices that the fact of Christ's having "suffered without the camp" serves as an indication that his blood had in its atoning effects been carried by him into heaven, the antitype of the holy of holies (Heb. xiii. 12). The flesh of the other goat, offered as a sin offering, would have been eaten by the priests in the evening, at a sacrificial meal (ch. x. 17, 18).

Ver. 29—31.—The ceremonies of the Day of Atonement are not appointed for once only, but they are to be of annual observance. This shall be a statute for ever unto you, as long as the nation should exist, that in the seventh month, on the tenth day of the month, ye shall afflict your souls, and do no work at all. The seventh is the sacred month, in which the first, the tenth, the fifteenth, and following days are appointed as holy seasons. The Day of Atonement is the single fast of the Jewish Church occurring once a year only. On it all the members of that Church were to afflict their souls, on pain of death (ch. xxiii. 29). The

fast began on the evening of the ninth day, and ended on the evening of the tenth, when it was succeeded by general feasting. During the whole of the twenty-four hours *no work at all* was to be done. In this respect the Day of Atonement was put on a level with the sabbath, whereas on the annual festivals only "servile work" was forbidden (see ch. xxiii. 7, 21, 25, 35). On this day, therefore, as on the weekly sabbath, it was not permitted to collect manna (Exod. xvi. 26), or to plough or reap (Exod. xxxiv. 21), or to light a fire (Exod. xxxv. 3), or to gather wood (Numb. xv. 32—36), or to carry corn or fruit (Neh. xiii. 15), or to sell food or other goods (Neh. xiii. 16), or to bear burdens (Jer. xvii. 22, 23), or to set out grain for sale (Amos viii. 5). And these regulations applied to strangers that sojourned among them as well as to themselves. It was a sabbath of rest; literally, a *sabbath of sabbatism*. The purpose of the abstinence from food and labour was to bring the soul of each individual into harmony with the solemn rites of purification publicly performed not by themselves, but by the high priest.

Ver. 32, 33.—That there may be no mistake, it is specifically enjoined that not only Aaron, but the priest, whom he shall anoint, and whom he shall consecrate—meaning, the *high priest that shall be anointed, and shall be consecrated*—to minister in the priest's office in his father's stead—that is, to succeed from time to time to the high priesthood—shall make the atonement, and shall put on the linen clothes, even the holy garments. Again it may be noticed that the white robes are termed, not the penitential, but the holy, garments.

Ver. 34.—This shall be an everlasting statute unto you. It lasted as long as the earthly Jerusalem lasted, and until the heavenly Jerusalem was instituted, when it had a spiritual fulfilment once for all. "Of old there was an high priest that cleansed the people with the blood of bulls and goats, but now that the true High Priest is come, the former priesthood is no more. It is a providential dispensation of God that the city and temple of Jerusalem have been destroyed; for if they were still standing, some who are weak in faith might be dazzled by the outward splendour of the literal types, and not drawn by faith to the spiritual antitypes. If there are any, therefore, who, in considering the Levitical ritual of the great Day of Atonement, and in looking at the two he-goats—the one sacrificed, the other let go, charged with sins, into the wilderness—do not recognize the one Christ who died for our sins and took away our sins, and do not see there the 'everlasting statute' of which God here speaks by

Moses, let him go up thrice a year to Jerusalem, and there search for the altar which has crumbled in the dust, and offer up his victim there without a priest. But no; thanks be to God, the earthly priesthood and temple are abolished, that we may raise our heart to the heavenly, and look up with faith and love and joy to him who

offered himself once for all, and who ever liveth to make intercession for us" (Origen, 'Hom.' x., as quoted by Wordsworth). And he did as the Lord commanded Moses; that is, Moses announced to Aaron the Law which was to be carried out about five months later.

### HOMILETICS.

Vers. 1-28.—*Union and communion with God* is that which the undepraved heart of man most longs for, and which religion is especially intended to bring about. That this may be effected, the barrier of sin, and of that which represents sin—ceremonial uncleanness—must be broken down. If sin and uncleanness cannot be taken away so as to be as though they had not been, they must, according to their nature, be either punished as justice demands, or be so covered over as to be withdrawn from the sight of the Divine eye. This covering or atonement is wrought by sacrifices for sin, and ceremonial purifications. Hence the public and private sin offerings, and the various forms of cleansing. But in spite of penalties inflicted and sacrifices offered, a mass of crime and sin and uncleanness accumulates year by year, which has not been avenged or cleansed, and this defilement affects the very tabernacle of God and his holy things, as well as the congregation of living men. Therefore an annual atonement and reconciliation were required, which were effected each year on the great Day of Atonement.

#### I. THE CEREMONIES.

1. Bathing.
2. Robing in white garments.
3. The sin offerings.
4. The entry into the holy of holies.
5. The sprinkling of the blood of the sin offerings on the ark and before the mercy-seat.
6. The scapegoat.

II. THEIR MEANING. All is typical of Christ.

1. Washing with his blood and in the waters of baptism.
2. Clothing with his righteousness.
3. Christ the Sin Offering on the cross.
4. Christ's ascension and entry into heaven (Heb. ix., x.).
5. Christ's life-blood offered on the cross, and carried by him into heaven.
6. Christ the Sin-bearer and the Remover of sins.

III. THE LESSONS. 1. *Reconciliation between God and man has been effected.* For Christ has come and has offered himself as a sin offering. The mass of sins which gathered over mankind age after age, has been covered or atoned for by the blood of Christ, shed by him upon the cross; and those who were alienated are now reconciled. Christ is the all-prevailing Peacemaker, who has united man with man, and man with God. "He is our peace, who hath made both (Gentile and Jew) one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; . . . for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace; and that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby. . . . For through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father. Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God" (Eph. ii. 14-19). And this reconciliation was wrought by one offering, once for all offered. The high priest's atonement was made annually, for the blood of bulls and goats could not, effectually and permanently, but only symbolically and temporarily, take away sins (Heb. x. 4). "But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God. . . . For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified" (Heb. x. 12-14). And it was wrought for all mankind. How, then, are all to share in it? By realizing their adoption in Christ, which has been potentially bestowed upon

the whole family of man, and is made effective to each individual by his "belief" "in the Word of truth," and his being "sealed" in baptism "with the Holy Spirit of promise" (Eph. i. 13). The spiritual bathing, and clothing in white garments, which are now the privileges of every Christian, derive their sacramental force solely from the Sacrifice of the cross.

2. *Christ has opened for us the way to heaven.* Christ is not only the antitype of the sin offering made for the congregation, but also of the high priest who sacrificed the offering; for he, the Priest, offered himself, the Victim. The holy of holies, wherein the presence of God exhibited itself, was the type of heaven. Into this place "went the high priest alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people: the Holy Ghost this signifying, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest" (Heb. ix. 7, 8). Alone, the high priest entered beyond the mysterious veil, and no one might be present, even in the outer chamber of the tabernacle, at the time of his entrance, nor while he was fulfilling his functions before the ark. He could not take any one with him. Not even after the atonement had been made, could those who had been reconciled, whether priests or people, enter there. The veil was drawn again, and all was shrouded in silence and mystery as before. But "Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us" (Heb. ix. 24). At his ascension he entered heaven, and (unlike the high priest) there he remained at the right hand of God (Heb. x. 13), having received gifts for men from his Father, and having bestowed them upon his Church by the operation of his Spirit (Eph. iv. 8—11). And not only so, but he opened the way to all his followers. He was the mystical Head, and where the Head was, there the Body would be likewise. By his death he purchased for man an entrance into the presence of God, and an eternal continuance before the throne. "Having therefore boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us through the veil, that is to say, his flesh; and having an high priest over the house of God; let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water" (Heb. x. 19—22).

3. *Christ has borne, and borne away, our sins.* "Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all" (Isa. liii. 4—6). "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many" (Heb. ix. 28). "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed" (1 Pet. ii. 24). Christ, by his sacrifice, not only earns for us forgiveness of sin, but also gives us a consciousness of their forgiveness. Those who, in self-abasement and self-abandonment, have thrown themselves at the foot of the cross, have arisen assured of the pardon of their sins, as though they had seen and felt the burden of them taken off from their necks, and carried step by step into a land cut off, from whence no return for them is possible. If there are any who feel overcome by the weight of their sins, they are taught here that, if they cannot bear them, there is One who can bear them, and that, though they cannot free themselves from them, yet they can be freed. "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world!" (John i. 29).

IV. *WARNING.* Washed, robed, reconciled, and delivered from sin, and from the consciousness of sin,—what more could have been done for us that God has not done? What return are we to make? We are to live as children of God. "Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering; (for he is faithful that promised;) and let us consider one another to provoke unto love and to good works" (Heb. x. 23, 24). *Further warning.* The danger of falling away after having been forgiven and admitted to the privileges of sonship. "For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries" (Heb. x. 26, 27). One unclean spirit may be exchanged for seven (Matt. xiii. 43—45).

"See that ye refuse not him that speaketh. . . . For our God is a consuming fire" (Heb. xii. 25, 29).

Vers. 29-34.—*The annual reiteration of the purification made on the Day of Atonement* testifies to the imperfections of the Law. "For the Law can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually make the comers thereunto perfect. For then would they not have ceased to be offered?" (Heb. x. 1, 2). Had they done their work perfectly, a repetition of them would not have been required, "because that the worshippers once purged should have had no more conscience of sins" (Heb. x. 2). There was a triple imperfection—in the priest, in the victim, in the effect of the sacrifices. The Levitical priesthood was formed of sinful men, as was testified by the sin offering which the high priest had first to offer for himself before he could offer one for the people: here there was no perfect mediator. The victims were a bullock and a goat; but "it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins" (Heb. x. 4): here there was no perfect sacrifice. The atonement had to be repeated annually: here there was no perfect result from the offering made. By its very imperfection the Law points forward to and awakens the desire for a better covenant, with a priest after the order of Melchisedec, "holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners" (Heb. vii. 26), with a sacrifice which could sanctify (Heb. x. 10), and which is and can be only "once offered," because it is "a full, perfect, and sufficient Sacrifice, Oblation, and Satisfaction for the sins of the whole world" (Service for Holy Communion).

#### HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

Vers. 1-34.—*The great Day of Atonement* (vers. 29-34). One day in the year set apart to the most solemn representation possible of the two facts—the sinfulness of man, the righteous love of God. Atonement underlying the whole of the ceremonial Law, but the insufficiency of the daily sacrifices, set forth by the separation of one day for the special sacrifice, thus pointing to *one* atonement in which all other atonements should be perfected. Solemn warning in the death of the two sons of Aaron, proclaiming the unchangeableness of Divine Law, and unapproachableness of God in his infinite righteousness. Necessity that, while the cloud upon the mercy-seat spoke of holiness and majesty, there should be a more emphatic testimony to love and mercy. Yet that testimony must be in the way of Law and ordinance, therefore itself maintaining that God is just while he is merciful. These preliminary considerations prepare us to take the "great Day of Atonement" as a typical prophecy fulfilled in the revelation of Christ. Notice—

I. **THE MEDIATION BETWEEN GOD AND MAN MUST BE A PERFECT MEDIATION.**  
 1. **Personal perfection.** For ordinary ministration, washing feet and hands sufficient. For the great day, entire cleansing. This must be. A fellow-creature, imperfect and sinful, may be employed as a channel of communication between God and us, but not as the efficient Mediator undertaking for both. The spotlessness of Jesus must be more than relative, more than character; it must be absolute, therefore, only as we see it in the Incarnation. Nor can we find satisfaction in the humanity of Christ unless we believe that it was capable of rendering to God an infinitely acceptable sacrifice; therefore, while it was flesh, it must have been free from all taint of sin. We lay our sins on him; then he must be himself absolutely sinless, or else our sins will be increased by his. Only in the pre-existence of the Second Person in the Trinity can we find a support for this doctrine of personal perfection in the man Christ Jesus.

2. **Official perfection.** The high priest must be clothed in spotless garments. "*Holy garments.*" He put off his "golden garments," and put on the white linen, emblematical of official perfection. The continual repetition of the sacrifices and the priestly ablutions, together with the special priestly offerings, represented the necessary imperfection of the ceremonial atonement. The priest's office was seen in its height of dignity in the high priest's office; the high priest's office in its most solemn duty, to enter the holiest once a year and make atonement for all. But the true High Priest

and the true mediation were yet to come. The ministry of Christ was a *perfect offering of man to God*, in his active and passive obedience, and a *perfect revelation and assurance of Divine favour to man*; in the *facts of his earthly life*, promising healing and restoration for human woes, and life from the dead; in the development of a perfect humanity by example; in the unfolding and proclamation of the heavenly kingdom, which actually commenced in his person, and proceeded in ever-widening spheres of spiritual life in his Church; in his *risen glory and the bestowment of the Holy Spirit*, which were the completion of his official work as Mediator, for he said that if he went to the Father (that is, as Mediator), he would send the Comforter. Thus the vail was taken away, and the way into the holiest made manifest (Heb. ix. 8; x. 19—23). Our High Priest is not one of an imperfect succession of Aaron's sons, but after the order of Melchisedeck, coming forth directly from God, and standing in unique perfection; the pledge at once of Divine acceptance and the spiritual liberty of the gospel.

II. VICARIOUS ATONEMENT. The three facts of the day were: 1. The blood of the victims shed and sprinkled. 2. The living way opened between the throne of God and his people. 3. The public, solemn putting away of sins and their loss, as guilt, in the wilderness. In the true atonement, thus represented, these are the essential factors—*expiation, reconciliation, restoration*.

1. *Expiation.* The blood of the bullock, the blood of the goat, brought in before the mercy-seat, sprinkled seven times, etc. No remission of sins without blood. A tribute to the holiness of God, therefore to the perfection of the Divine government. No peace can be true and abiding which has not its roots in the unchangeableness of God. Notice how the modern feeling of the steadfastness and uniformity of nature vindicates the necessity of a forgiveness of sin which is a maintenance of Law. The sufferings of Christ must be viewed, not as the arbitrary assignment of a penalty, but as the sufferings of the sacrificial Victim, i.e. of him whose blood, that is, his life, was freely offered to seal the covenant, and who, being in the form of a servant, obeyed even unto death; made of a woman, made under the Law, therefore both having a fleshly, mortal nature, and being in a position of obedience, wherein he must, as a true Son, "fulfil all righteousness." The cross was an open conflict between righteousness and unrighteousness, in which the true representative Seed of the woman, the true Humanity, was bruised, and, as a Victim, laid bleeding and dying on the altar; but in which, at the same time, the acceptance of the offering, as proved by the Resurrection and Ascension, was a manifestation of the victory of righteousness and the putting away of sin. The universality of the expiation was represented by the offering for priests and people alike, for the holy place, for the very mercy-seat, for all the worship and religious life of the congregation. Apart from the merit of the Saviour's blood, there is no acceptance of anything which we offer to God. The attempt to eliminate all distinctive recognition of expiation from religious worship, is the folly of our times in many who reject the teaching of Christianity. A temple without a sacrifice, without the blood which is the remission of sins, is a contradiction of the first truth of Scripture, that man is a fallen being, and can therefore be acceptable to God only on God's own revealed terms of atonement.

2. *Reconciliation* (vers. 11—14). The true conception of salvation is not a mere deliverance from the punishment of sin, but living fellowship between God and his creature. The life of man is the outcome of God's wisdom, power, goodness, unchangeable and everlasting. He carries eternity and divinity in his very nature and existence. His future blessedness, yea, his very being, must be secured in God's favour. The burning coals of fire from off the altar, and the sweet incense beaten small, rising up as a cloud before the mercy-seat, betoken the intermingling of the Divine and human in the life of God's reconciled children. This is maintained by the offerings of faith and prayer: the light of Divine truth penetrating the mind and life of man, the heart rejoicing in God and seeking him by a constant reference of all things to him, and dependence of daily life on his mercy. When thus the will and love of God underlie all our existence and pervade it, there is an open way between this world and heaven; the two are intermingled. Man becomes what he was made to be—a reflection of his Maker's image. "I will say, It is my people, and they shall say, The Lord is our God." Christianity has the only true message of hope for the world, because it proclaims reconciliation between the infinite perfection of God and the polluted and imperfect humanity which he has redeemed.

3. *Restoration* (vers. 20-28). *The scapegoat*—an emblem of the entire deliverance of man from the guilt and misery of sin. The necessity of this proclamation of a new world. Heathen minds recognized the evil of sin, but lay under the spell of fatalistic despair. “No symbol could so plainly set forth the completeness of Jehovah’s acceptance of the penitent, as a sin offering in which a life was given up for the altar, and yet a living being survived to carry away all sin and uncleanness.” The commencement of all renovation of character and life is the sense of entire forgiveness, perfect peace with God. The sins are gone into the wilderness, they have not to be cleansed away by any efforts of ours. Spiritual restoration lies at the root of all other. “*The kingdom of God*” is first “righteousness,” then “peace,” and then “*joy in the Holy Ghost*.” This is the Divine order of restoration. But as the priest put his hand upon the head of the goat, and confessed over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, so in the Divine work of grace on behalf of man, there must be the living faith which blends the penitent submission of the human will with the infinite sufficiency of the Divine righteousness and power.—R.

Ver. 31.—“*A sabbath of rest*.” “Ye shall afflict your souls.” The true penitence is the true peace. The “sabbath” represents the joyful acceptance of the creature, and his entrance into the Divine satisfaction. The Lord rested, and he invites man to rest with him. Sin is the only obstacle to that reconciliation and fellowship which blends man’s sabbath with God’s sabbath. “Once a year” the Jews celebrated this restoration, to us a statute of daily life—every day a sabbath.—R.

*The climax of sacrificial worship, the Day of Atonement.* Ch. xvi.; cf. John i. 29; 1 Cor. v. 7; Heb. ix. x. The sacrifices already considered all bring out with more or less emphasis the idea of atonement. But to render this cardinal idea of our religion still more emphatic, it was ordained that the tenth day of the seventh month in each year should be a day of special humiliation on the part of the people, and special ritual on the part of the priests. The directions about it were apparently given immediately after the presumption and death of Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron. They must have ventured, we think, into the very “holiest of all,” with their censers of unholy fire. The stages in atonement may be set forth in the following way:—

I. **THERE IS THE VOLUNTARY HUMILIATION OF THE HIGH PRIEST.** The Day of Atonement was the high priest’s day; he undertook the atoning work, and no man was to venture near the tabernacle (ver. 17) while he was engaged in it. The first thing required of him was *humiliation*. He had to lay aside his glorious garments in which he usually ministered, and to assume plain white linen ones; he had to bring a sin offering for himself and household; he had thus to humble himself under the mighty hand of God, before he could be exalted by admission to the Divine presence. Now, it requires the high priest with his sin offering to typify with any adequacy Jesus Christ. For he is both our High Priest and our Sin Offering. He humbles himself to die as a Sacrifice upon the cross; he is a voluntary Sacrifice—he offers himself (Heb. vii. 27). The humiliation of our High Priest can only be judged by our conception of the *glory* of Divinity which he temporarily resigned, added to the depth of ignominy into which in his crucifixion he came. All this was necessary that a way of reconciliation might be opened up for sinners.

II. **THE HIGH PRIEST WAS REQUIRED NEXT TO PERFUME THE AUDIENCE CHAMBER WITH INCENSE.** He proceeded with a censer of coals from off the altar, and a handful of incense, and was careful to fill the holy of holies with the fragrant cloud. Here again does it require the incense, in addition to the priest, to typify the relations of Jesus to our atonement. The work of atonement begins in his intercession. Think how he prayed during his life on earth—how earnest his prayer in Gethsemane was when he sweat as it were great drops of blood; think, further, how his intercession is continued in the heavenly places. Prayer is the beginning, middle, and end of the redemptive work. Without this incense, even the blood of the unblemished lamb would lose much of its effect.

It seems evident from this that we must put away those hard and business-like illustrations of atonement, as a hard bargain driven on the one side and paid literally and in full on the other. We must allow a sufficient sphere in our conceptions for the

play of intercession and appeal, and remember that, while it is a God of justice who is satisfied, he proves himself in the transaction a God of grace.

III. **AFTER THE INCENSE THERE IS BROUGHT IN THE BLOOD, FIRST OF HIS OWN SIN OFFERING, AND THEN OF THE PEOPLE'S.** The blood of Jesus Christ is symbolized by both, and the act of sprinkling it before God is also to be attributed to our Great High Priest. "For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us." "Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us" (Heb. ix. 24, 12). Now, the presentation of blood unto God, and the sprinkling of it seven times in the appointed place, represented the appeal which the self-sacrifice of Jesus, his Son, is so well calculated to make to the Divine mercy in the interests of guilty men. The law of mediation is that self-sacrifice stimulates the element of mercy in the Judge.<sup>1</sup> And if it be objected that surely God does not require such an expensive stimulant, the reply is that the self-sacrificing Son and the stimulated Father and Judge are in essence one. The act is consequently a Divine self-sacrifice, to stimulate the element of mercy towards man, and make it harmonize with justice. Here then we have remission of sins secured through the shedding of the blood of Jesus. Pardon and reconciliation are thus put within the reach of the sinner.

IV. **BUT THE HIGH PRIEST WAS EXPECTED NOT ONLY TO SECURE THE PARDON OF SINS, BUT ALSO TO PUT IT AWAY BY THE DISMISSAL OF THE SCAPEROAT.** For the pardon of sin is not all man needs. He requires sin to be put away from him. He needs to be enabled to sing, "As far as the east is from the west, so far hath he removed our transgressions from us" (Ps. ciii. 12). Now, this putting away of sin was beautifully represented in the dismissal of the scapegoat. This second sin offering, after having the sins of the people heaped upon its head by the priestly confession, is sent away in care of a faithful servant to the wilderness, there to be left in loneliness either to live or die. Here again we have a type of Jesus. He is our Scapegoat. He carried our sins on his devoted head into that wilderness of desolation and loneliness, which compelled from him the cry, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" There did he fully atone for them, and secured their annihilation. As we meditate upon this portion of his mediation, we are enabled by the Spirit to realize that sin is put away through Christ's sacrifice of himself (Heb. ix. 26). That desolation of the Redeemer into which he entered for us interposes itself, so to speak, between us and our sins, and we feel a wholesome separation from them. How can we ever love sin when we realize that it led our Lord to this?

V. **THE HIGH PRIEST, HAVING THUS DISPOSED OF SIN, RESUMED HIS GLORIOUS GARMENTS, AND OFFERED THE BURNT OFFERING FOR HIMSELF AND THE PEOPLE.** The stages already noticed have been prayer, the remission of sins through the shedding of blood, and the putting away of sin through the dismissal of the victim. Now comes dedication as the crowning purpose of the atonement, and which the burnt offering all along has indicated. It is Christ who offers this burnt offering, and is the Burnt Offering. That is to say, he has offered for men a perfect righteousness, as well as afforded us a perfect example. Our consecration to God is ideally to be a perfect one—but really how imperfect! but Christ is made unto us sanctification; we are complete in him; we are accepted in the Beloved; and we learn and try to live as he lived, holy as he was holy.

Moreover, upon the burnt offering was presented the fat of the sin offering, the Lord thus emphasizing his satisfaction with the atonement, and his acceptance of it. The remainder of the sin offering, as a sacred thing, is carried to a clean place without the camp, and there burned. In no more beautiful way could God convey the assurance to his people that the ritual of atonement was complete and acceptable to him. It is when we gratefully dedicate ourselves to God, which is our reasonable service, that we receive the assurance of acceptance in the Beloved.

VI. **THE WASHING OF THE THREE MEN OFFICIATING ON THE DAY OF ATONEMENT CONVEYS SURELY THE IDEA OF THE CONTAMINATING POWER OF SIN.** For the high priest, before he puts on the glorious garments and presents the burnt offering, is

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Mozley, *ut supra*, p. 169.

required to wash himself in water. The man who piloted the scapegoat to the wilderness has also to perform careful and complete ablutions. And so has the man who took the remains of the sin offering beyond the camp. For all three had to deal with sin, and are ceremonially affected by it. Most vivid must have been the impression thus produced upon the people. Sin would appear the abominable thing which God hates, when it is so defiling.

We have here the climax of the sacrificial worship. The Day of Atonement would be a rest indeed to the sin-burdened people. At the tabernacle they see in ritual how God could be reconciled to man, and how he could pardon and put away sin. As the smoke of the burnt offering passed up to heaven, many a soul felt that a burden was gone, and that the heavens were smiling once more. May the experience of the day of atonement abide in our hearts still, for we need it as much as the pilgrims long ago.—R. M. E.

**Vers. 1-4.—*The high priest on the Day of Atonement.*** The Jewish high priest was an eminent type of Christ. He was this on ordinary occasions of his ministry, in respect to which Jesus is called “the High Priest of our profession” (Heb. iii. 1). But he was especially so upon this great occasion of his entrance into the most holy place.

**I. THE MOST HOLY PLACE OF THE TEMPLE WAS A TYPE OF HEAVEN.** 1. *The tabernacle was a figure of the universe.* (1) It represented the *material* universe. In allusion to this, Paul speaks of the universe as the great house built by the hands of God (see Heb. iii. 3, 4). And our Lord, also, alluding to the temple with its many courts and offices, speaks of the universe as his Father’s house (John xiv. 1). (2) It likewise represented the *moral* universe. In this light it is also viewed by Paul in the same connection as that in which he likens it to the material (see Heb. iii. 6). In many places of Scripture the people of God are described under the similitude of the temple (see 1 Cor. iii. 16; 2 Cor. vi. 16; Eph. ii. 21, 22; 1 Pet. ii. 5). 2. *The holy places signified the heavens.* (1) Amongst the coverings were what our version calls “badgers’ skins,” but the original word (*תְּכַשֵּׁשׁ*), *techesh*, in ancient versions is explained to denote a colour, viz. *blue*. The covering may have been composed of rams’ skins dyed *blue*, as the other covering was of “rams’ skins dyed *red*.” *Blue* was the proper colour to suggest the *air*, while the *red* would suggest the golden glow of the *light* in the ethereal heavens. (2) Josephus, speaking of the gate of the porch of the temple, which stood always open, styles it an “emblem of the heavens.” And the veil leading from the porch to the holy place, made like Babylonish tapestry (Josh. vii. 21) of blue, purple, scarlet, and fine twined linen, he compares to the elements (*Wars*, v. 5). Josephus also describes the branched candlestick, with its seven lights, as emblems of the planets of the solar system. (3) But whatever may be said of details, the broad fact is not left to conjecture or even to tradition; for Paul tells us plainly that the holy places were patterns of the heavens (Heb. iv. 14; ix. 23). 3. *The most holy place figured the supreme heaven.* (1) This must be obvious from the fact that the Shechinah was there. God appeared then in regal state upon his throne of glory. The cherubim around him represented the powers of creation, physical and intellectual, which all wait upon him to fulfil his will everywhere in the great universe. Their faces were so placed that, while they all looked inward upon the propitiatory, they also looked outward in all directions upon the house. (2) This innermost sanctuary Paul accordingly describes as “heaven itself”—an expression synonymous to the “third heaven,” and “heaven of heavens” (Heb. ix. 24; 2 Cor. xii. 2, Deut. x. 14; Ps. cxv. 16). It is the palace of God and of angels.

**II. THE ENTRANCE OF THE HIGH PRIEST INTO THE MOST HOLY PLACE ADUMBRATED THAT OF JESUS INTO HEAVEN.** (See Heb. viii. 1, 2; ix. 11, 12, 23, 24.) 1. *He entered in his white garments.* (1) Not in his “golden robes.” These are vulgarly supposed to have been his nobler vestments, and it is thought that entering in his white garments he appeared in “mean” attire, to express “humiliation” and “mourning” (see Matthew Henry, *in loc.*). (2) But is this opinion just? Where are the white robes of the high priest so described in Scripture? Is it not rather the other way (see Ezek. xliv. 17)? Are the seven angels (Rev. xv. 6) described as in mean attire? As a matter of fact, did Jesus *meanly* or *mourningly* enter heaven? Was it not rather his entrance “into

his glory" after his "sufferings" were "finished" (Luke xxiv. 26)? (3) The white robes represented the glorious body of his resurrection (see 1 Tim. vi. 14—16; Heb. ix. 24, 25). And a specimen of the quality of these garments was given on the mount of transfiguration, when the light of his glory was so white that no fuller on earth could make linen to compare with it (see Matt. xvii. 2; Mark ix. 3). 2. *Note now the allusion to Nadab and Abihu.* (1) (See ver. 1; refer also to ch. x. i, 2.) This terrible event occurred in the wilderness of Sinai (Numb. iii. 4), where the Law was given, and where these very men were called up with Aaron to witness the glory of the Lord (Exod. xxiv. 1). Whatever induced them to offer strange fire, they became, in the sequel, a figure of Jesus, who came not with legal righteousness, and whom the fire of God was to search to the utmost. (2) Aaron now became a similar type (see ver. 2). He was to die if he came near Jehovah, and so represented Jesus, who, in the union of his manhood with the Godhead, was to die. This issue was only averted from Aaron by the substitution of animal sacrifices, which were to procure the "forbearance of God," until Immanuel should put away typical sin sacrifices by the sacrifice of himself. (3) To avert death from Aaron, God appointed that incense also should be fumed before the mercy-seat, in the cloud of which he would appear (vers. 2, 12, 13). The cloud tempered the fierceness of the fire of the presence of God, and showed that, in virtue of the intercession of Christ, man may see God and live.—J. A. M.

Vers. 5—28.—*The sacrifices of the Day of Atonement.* Upon ordinary occasions sacrifices might be offered by common priests, who might act as representatives of the high priest or as representatives of the people, and so be types of Christ, or types of Christians. But upon this day the high priest must act in person, which leaves no doubt as to these transactions being eminently emblematical of Christ and of his great work. We notice—

I. **THE OFFERINGS FOR AARON AND HIS HOUSE.** (See ver. 6.) 1. *In these Christ is viewed in his relation to his Church.* (1) The Christian Church is the house or family of Jesus (Heb. iii. 6). (See Ps. cxxxv. 19, where the "house of Aaron," as opposed to the "house of Israel," may be spiritually construed to denote the *Christian* as opposed to the *Hebrew Church*.) (2) To his Church Jesus stands in the relations of (a) Priest, (b) Sacrifice, (c) Bondsman. He bears our sin in his own person, and dies for us, as Aaron would have died for his own sin and that of his house, had not the sin sacrifices been substituted to procure the forbearance of God until our competent Aaron should appear to satisfy all the claims of justice and mercy. (3) Aaron, in making atonement for himself and his house, evinced that Christ should be a priest having compassion (see Heb. v. 2, 3). For though Jesus had no sin of his own, yet did he take upon him our nature, with its curse, so as to be "touched with the feeling of our infirmities" (comp. Heb. vii. 28, margin; ii. 18; iv. 15). What a blessed assurance for us! 2. *But Christ cannot be of the family of Aaron.* (1) Aaron for himself and for all his house needed sacrifices to atone for their own sins; how then could they put away sin from others? This they could only do typically and ceremonially (see Heb. vii. 26, 27). (2) Provision was made in the family of Aaron for the transmission of the priesthood from hand to hand; it was therefore never contemplated that any member of that house should have the priesthood in perpetuity. But this we must have in the office of a perfect Priest. His intercession must have no interruption (see Heb. vii. 23—25). (3) To fulfil these conditions, Christ is come, a high priest after the order of Melchisedec (Ps. cx. 4; Heb. vii. 15—22). He sprang from Judah, of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood (Heb. vii. 11—14). We may praise God for the perfection of the priesthood of Christ, which needs no supplement in the offices of mortals.

II. **THE OFFERINGS FOR THE PEOPLE.** 1. *There was the burnt offering.* (1) This, under ordinary circumstances, for the individual might be a bullock, or a ram, or a he-goat, or, in case of poverty, a pigeon; but in this case for the nation, as in the consecration of the priests, the ram is specified (ch. i. 3, 10, 14; viii. 18). It is suggested that this animal was chosen for the offensiveness of its smell, in order to represent the odiousness of sin. (2) In this case also the high priest in person, and alone, officiated. No one was to remain with him in the tabernacle of the congregation (ver. 17). What an expressive figure of Christ (see Isa. lxiii. 3, 5; Zech. xiii. 7; Matt. xxvi. 81,

56; John xvi. 32)! No one could help Jesus in his great work of atonement. 2. *The sacrifice of the two goats now claims attention.* (1) Two are brought, to foreshadow what one could not adequately, viz. that one part only of the compound person of Christ could die, while both parts were necessary for his making atonement. The animal on which the lot fell to be the scapegoat was to stand alive before the Lord, to make atonement with him (ver. 10; see Heb. viii. 3; 1 Pet. iii. 18). The "somewhat" which our high priest has to offer is his humanity, which his Godhead supported and rendered infinitely efficacious for the expiation of sin. (2) In casting lots upon the goats, one for the Lord, and the other for the scapegoat, we are taught that the sufferings of Christ were ordered by the providence of God (see Acts iv. 28). This is amply evinced in the wonderfully detailed anticipations of prophecy. (3) Aaron laid his two hands upon the head of the creature that was to be the scapegoat, and confessed the sins of the congregation. These were such as may not have been atoned for by the usual sacrifices. And they are summed up as "iniquities" and "transgressions" and "sins" (ver. 21). Laden with these, (4) he was sent away "by the hand of a man of opportunity" (ver. 21, margin). Such was Simon the Cyrenian, who bore the cross on which the atonement was to be made for sin (Matt. xxvii. 32; see Gal. vi. 14; Eph. ii. 16; Col. ii. 14). Jesus was hurried along to his execution by the rabble rather than by any officer appointed to lead him. And as the man of opportunity was to be unclean until he had bathed his flesh and washed his clothes, so will the blood of the murder of Jesus be upon the Jews until it is cleansed by their repentance and faith (comp. Matt. xxvii. 25 and Joel iii. 21). (5) The scapegoat was to go away with its burden into a "land not inhabited," or "land of separation," a "wilderness," a place in which it might be lost sight of. This was designed to teach us how effectually our sins are borne away into oblivion by Christ (Ps. ciii. 12; Isa. xxxviii. 17; Micah vii. 19; John i. 29; Heb. viii. 12). To set forth this important truth, it was also ordered that the bodies of those beasts whose blood was brought into the sanctuary by the high priest for sin, were *burnt without the camp* (ver. 27; Heb. xiii. 11, 12). So, like the "man of opportunity," whoever burnt the sin offering became unclean, and so remained until he had washed (see Zech. xiii. 1). Have we been purified from all complicity in the guilt of the crucifixion of Jesus?—J. A. M.

Vers. 29-34.—*The Day of Atonement.* In this summary we have the design of the statute.

I. ATONEMENT WAS MADE FOR THE TABERNACLE. 1. *The work of Christ affects the material universe.* (1) The tabernacle, we have seen (see on vers. 1-4), was a type of the universe, material and moral; and that the holy places represented the heavens. The sprinkling of the tabernacle and its holy places, therefore, teaches that the universe is affected by the atonement of Christ (vers. 15-19, 33; Heb. ix. 12, 23, 24; Rev. v. 6). (2) Aaron, as the type of Christ, entered into the holiest place, but then only once in the year, nor could he without dying open an entrance into it even for his son, who, in his turn, could only enter there as the type of Christ. This showed that, while the tabernacle stood, the way into the holiest was not made manifest. But the veil was not only rent in the torn flesh of Jesus, so that he himself became the Way, but he entered heaven himself once for all (Heb. x. 19, 20). (3) Do we avail ourselves of the privileges of our spiritual priesthood (Heb. x. 21, 22)? 2. *The work of Christ influences the moral universe.* (1) Angels, therefore, manifested interest in the sufferings of Christ and the glories that should follow (Exod. xxv, 20; Dan. viii. 13; 1 Pet. i. 11-13). The sprinkling of the holy places teaches that, through the atonement of Christ, holy angels are reconciled to us. By the sanctifying power of his grace we are brought into sympathy with them. (2) They are now, therefore, interested in the welfare of the Church; and are themselves a part of the great family of Jesus (see Dan. xii. 5, 6; Eph. i. 10; iii. 10, 15; Phil. ii. 9-11).

II. ATONEMENT WAS MADE FOR THE PEOPLE. 1. *None were exempted from the need of it.* (1) Aaron and his house were in the same category with the people in this respect. Though types, they were yet sinful men. (2) But through the blood-shedding of this day, all stood "clean from all sins before the Lord," i.e. he looked upon them and accepted them as clean. So in the great day of judgment will he look upon us and accept us as clean through the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus.

Christ (Jude 24). 2. *It was a general expiation.* (1) It occurred but once in the year. It was to atone for iniquities, transgressions, and sins, which, through ignorance, inadvertency, or perhaps neglect, had not been atoned for by ordinary sacrifices. Christ not only atones for particular sins, but for sin itself. (2) It was repeated every year. The utmost the Jewish priest could do was to call sin to remembrance, and point to a greater than himself, who needed not to repeat his offering (see Heb. x. 1-3).

III. THE DAY OF ATONEMENT WAS TO BE KEPT AS A SABBATH. 1. *In it they were to afflict their souls.* (1) (See ver. 31; also Ps. xxxv. 13; Isa. lviii. 6, 7, 13; Dan. x. 3, 12.) (2) Resting from the toil of the world, with afflicted souls, while their sins were called to their remembrance, suggests that repentance towards God must accompany faith in the Lord Jesus Christ (Acts xx. 21). 2. *In it they were to rest.* (1) This suggested relief from the burden of sin. What a gracious sabbath in the soul is the sense of sins forgiven! (2) This would be all the more expressive upon the year of jubilee, which, every forty-ninth year, came in on the Day of Atonement (ch. xxv. 9). 3. *The time was the tenth day of the seventh month.* (1) Dr. Lightfoot computes that this was the anniversary of the day on which Moses came the last time down from the mount, bringing with him the renewed tables, and having the glory shining in his face. (2) Jesus appears literally to have ascended into the heavens, as his type passed behind the veil, on the tenth day of the seventh month (see reasoning conducting to this conclusion in the appendix of Mr. Guinness's work on 'The Approaching End of the Age'). It was the time of the vintage, and marks the fulness of the atonement (see Mark xii. 1-9; comp. Rev. xix. 15). (3) It may prove that, on some anniversary of this day, Jesus will come down from heaven, in a glory immeasurably brighter than that in which Moses descended from the mount, to set up his kingdom upon this earth (see Acts i. 11). The vintage of his wrath upon his enemies precedes the sabbath of his kingdom.—J. A. M.

Ver. 6.—*A solemn ceremony.* There was risk involved in drawing nigh to the manifested presence of the Deity. God desired not that the judgment upon Nadab and Abihu should be repeated; rather would he be "sanctified" by reverent approach at appointed seasons in appointed ways. The Almighty can cause the wrath of man to praise him, but he prefers to be honoured by the affection that seeks diligently to observe his precepts. Hence the directions issued concerning the great Day of Atonement, on which the high priest was to come into closest contact with Jehovah. Let us consider those directions so far as they related to the purging away of the uncleanness of the priests.

I. THE FACT THAT THE HIGH PRIEST WAS TO MAKE ATONEMENT FOR HIMSELF AND HIS HOUSE. 1. *It prevented pride, keeping alive in his breast a sense of infirmity.* The expression, "for his house," means his sons, and afterwards all who were of the priestly order. The pomp of office requires some guarantee against undue exaltation. A lofty position is apt to turn a weak man's head, and his fall becomes the more calamitous. It is certain that the highest in the Church of Christ cannot claim exemption from sin. 2. *It enkindled sympathy with those for whom he had to exercise his sacred functions* (see this beautifully insisted on in the Epistle to Heb. v. 2, 3). Note likewise the superiority of Christ's sympathy because of exquisite holy tenderness of spirit, unblunted by passion. Jesus Christ acquired a fellow-feeling by his humiliation in becoming man, and in being tempted in all points like as we are, whereas Aaron was exalted to be a high priest, and needed to remember his humanity. If Aaron forgot this, and treated the worshippers gruffly, not only would their feelings be wounded, but his intercession would be so much the less efficacious, for even under the Law sentiment was requisite as well as symbol. 3. Its priority to the atonement made for the people *emphasized the truth that only the cleansed can make others clean, only the sinless can rightly intercede for the sinful.* Because Jesus Christ is holy, he sanctifies his followers. He who was eminently forgiving could pray to his Father to forgive his murderers. None but believers saved through grace should preach the gospel. 4. *It prophesied the eventual supersession of Aaron's order by a perfect priesthood.* There was evidence of defect in its very face. Not always could God be satisfied with or man rejoice in imperfect mediation. An intercessor needing forgiveness for himself, a

purifier who had constantly to cleanse himself, pointed to the advent of One who should have no need to offer up yearly sacrifice on his own account, whose purity should be real, not merely ceremonial and symbolical.

II. THE CEREMONY ENJOINED. 1. *The attire.* The gorgeous clothing of colour, gold, bells, and pomegranates, was laid aside, the whole body washed in water, and a garb of white linen donned. It was a day in which the fact of sin was prominent, and splendour ill befit such an occasion. Besides, the high priest was not to look upon himself this day as representing God to the people, but as presenting the people to God, and a humble demeanour, indicated by plain attire, was appropriate to this function. Then, too, the white linen spoke of the holiness which the day's services were to secure. It was the garment of salvation, in which God manifested his willingness to be the Saviour of the people from their sins. 2. *The sacrifices,* a sin offering and a burnt offering. Leaving consideration for the present of what was peculiar to the day in the former, here note (1) that a harmony is observable in all God's laws. Whilst this sin offering had its special rites, in other respects it was to be treated according to the general rules—a portion consumed on the altar, and the carcase burnt outside the camp. A likeness is traceable in the dealings of God, whether ordinary or extraordinary. Underlying features are discerned similar to those ascertained in other departments. Miracles have their customary analogies and laws; the operations of the Spirit proceed on familiar lines and principles; the worship and service of heaven will present some of the aspects that have marked the gatherings in the sanctuaries of earth. (2) Again we observe how purification precedes consecration. The burnt offering followed the sin offering. After fresh ablution, the high priest arrayed himself in his usual vestments, and proceeded to place the holocaust upon the altar, to be the emblem of unreserved surrender to God's glory. Having been bought with the precious blood of Christ, and thus redeemed from sin, we are enabled to dedicate ourselves to the service of God. It is in vain that men attempt the latter without the former. 3. *The entrance into the holy of holies.* How solemn and full of awe the moment in which the priest drew aside the veil and came near to the Divine presence! He was alone with God! It was dark but for the mysterious light that appeared between the cherubim, and the glowing coals on which he put the incense. Not too clearly might man contemplate even "the cloud" that was the enwrapping of Jehovah; the cloud of incense must cast an additional covering over the mercy-seat. Not lingering to indulge profane curiosity, the high priest sprinkled the blood of the sin offering upon the front of the mercy-seat, and upon the floor of the holy place. What a view was thus obtained of the majesty of God! what thoughts of his condescension in permitting a sinful creature to have such access to him! May not we learn the impiety of seeking to pry too closely into the mysteries of the Divine existence? Prayer becomes us in appearing before him; then do we know most of God, and protect ourselves from death. And the prayer is made efficacious through the atoning blood. The ark containing the commandments which we have transgressed is covered by the golden plate of Divine mercy, and that mercy is everlastingly secured by the atonement wherewith it is honoured and appealed to.

CONCLUSION. The privilege of the high priest was nothing to what we enjoy. What boldness we may use in entering into the holiest by the blood of Jesus! What remission of sins, what freedom from guilt, what liberty and gladness are ours! *Our High Priest has entered as our Forerunner*, not for us merely, *into heaven itself* (Heb. ix. 8). As Aaron came forth from the sanctuary to the Israelites, so shall Christ appear, apart from sin, to them that wait for him unto salvation. He shall "receive us unto himself."—S. R. A.

Vers. 29—34.—*The Day of Atonement.* This was a day second to none in importance. The rites then celebrated were the most awe-inspiring of all, and concerned the whole nation, which stood watching outside the sacred enclosure of the tabernacle. Not the slightest deviation from the established ritual was allowable; it was too significant and solemn in character to permit of alteration.

I. It was a DAY OF UNIVERSAL ATONEMENT. The high priest made atonement for himself and the order of priests, for the people of the congregation, for the brazen altar, for the tabernacle, and for the sanctuary. Thus was taught the truth that sin

mingles with the holiest of men and their deeds, with the holiest things and places. Defilement attaches to our highest acts of worship, to our best thoughts and prayers. The tabernacle needed cleansing because of the "uncleanness" of the people (ver. 16) among whom it was situated. The noblest men receive some degree of contamination from their surroundings, and the purest principles have some alloy adhering to them through use. Mere ignorance of specific transgressions was not sufficient to obviate the necessity of atonement. Sin was there, though they should discern it not. "I know nothing against myself, yet am I not hereby justified." Could any spectacle more vividly impress upon the mind the reality of sin and the need of its removal?

II. It was a DAY OF HUMILIATION. "Ye shall afflict your souls." The word implies self-denial and consequent fasting. Not lightly was sin to be regarded! We are ever ready to extenuate our guilt and to minimize its enormity. The transgressions in respect of which a sin offering was prescribed were not high-handed acts of rebellion, but such as resulted from man's frailty, from natural depravity. Yet this was not deemed an excuse of itself, it only showed the importance of providing for its atonement. No man with a perception of the magnitude of his iniquity can retain a heart at ease, a conscience at rest. If there be such quietude, it is an evidence of the deadening influence of sin. Though sin has been overruled to the glory of God, it is in itself abominable, and must be viewed with abhorrence. Well may we bow before God in deep abasement!

III. It was a DAY OF REST. No work of any kind was permitted—it was a "sabbath of sabbaths." All the attention of the people was concentrated upon the ceremony observed by the high priest. What a rebuke here to those who cannot spare time to think of their state before God! Surely the transcendent importance of religion justifies occasional abstention from ordinary labour. What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and forfeit eternal life? The constitution of our minds does not enable us to think seriously of many things at once. Let not the concerns of the soul be thereby shelved. If we will not afford the necessary period here, there will come a long season of forced meditation, when the subject of sin and its forgiveness shall pierce us through and through with unutterable remorse.

IV. It was a FIXED DAY. God, in his merciful forethought, set apart the tenth day of the seventh month, lest the Israelites should forget the duty incumbent upon them. There are many advantages in having a time determined upon for religious worship. It comes regularly, and even children look for it. It prevents excuses, ensures due remembrance, and leads to fitting preparation. What is to be done at any time is practically for no time. But the observance of such days needs to be guarded against degenerating into formalism and routine. And under the gospel no adventitious sacramentarian importance must be annexed to these seasons, otherwise we fall under the censure of the apostle, as observing "days, and months, and seasons, and years." Oh! for wisdom to distinguish between the true and the false in ordinances!

V. It was a DAY OF YEARLY OBSERVANCE. The imperfection of other sacrifices and purifications was thus clearly demonstrated, for however attended to they did not exclude the Day of Atonement. And the yearly repetition of the day itself told the same tale, pointed the same moral of the impotence of the sacrifices of the Law to "make the comers thereunto perfect" (see Heb. x. 1—4). The day served its purpose indeed, but only by shadow and prefiguration. Compared with the Crucifixion, it was but a "splendid failure" to pacify the conscience, cleanse the heart, and quicken the life of those who participated in its effects.

VI. It was a DAY OF HUMILIATION THAT PREPARED THE WAY FOR A JOYOUS FESTIVAL. After five days commenced the Feast of Tabernacles, distinguished for its rejoicing beyond all others. The ceremonies of the Day of Atonement closed with a burnt offering, in which the people symbolically renewed their self-dedication to the worship and service of God; and very appropriately the chief feature of the Feast of Tabernacles was the large number of burnt offerings presented, as if the people should testify their gladness at the thought of pardoned iniquity, and of belonging to a God who so graciously blessed them and granted the increase of their fields. The man whose sin is forgiven and put away is truly happy. He can devote himself to God with glad ardour. The cloud that brought the storm and darkness has passed to the far horizon, and now it is brightened with many hues from the dazzling sun. Grief on account of sin is not designed to mar permanently the pleasure of our days. The depression is succeeded by elevation of soul.

The surgeon's lance may have pained us, but now we are tranquil through the relief afforded.—S. R. A.

**Vers. 1, 2.—*The peril of privilege.*** Was it, then, necessary to contemplate the possibility of Aaron's dying at his post? Was he, the chosen servant of God, who had been so solemnly inducted into his office (chs. viii., ix.), in actual peril of death as he ministered unto the Lord? Could he draw too near to God, so as to endanger his very life? It was even so. His two sons, Nadab and Abihu, had paid the extreme penalty of their sin in the service of Jehovah; "they offered before the Lord, and died" at their post. And if Aaron had violated the precepts here given, it is certain that from "the cloud upon the mercy seat" would have flashed the fatal fire which would have destroyed the high priest himself. We are not afraid now (1) of such condign and signal punishment as befall the sons of Aaron: God does not visit us thus in these days; nor (2) of coming too often or drawing too near to God. The barriers which then stood between the manifested Deity and the common people are removed. We may "come at all times" to the mercy-seat, and are in much greater peril of God's displeasure for "restraining prayer," than for intruding into his presence without need. Nevertheless, privilege has its own peculiar peril, and the penalty is very serious: it is death; not physical, but spiritual, eternal death. There may be in our case—

**I. PRESUMPTION FROM OFFICIAL POSITION.** It is only too possible that those who "offer before the Lord" may come to regard their official duties as things which avail before him, independently of the spirit in which they are rendered. "Many will say, . . . have we not prophesied in thy Name . . . and in thy Name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you" (Matt. vii. 22, 23). Many may say, "Have we not preached thy gospel, taught thy truth, evangelized in thy Name?" etc., and—trusting in their official works instead of looking to their inner spirit, and instead of attaching themselves to Christ in penitence and faith—be condemned at his bar.

**II. FORMALISM FROM FAMILIARITY.** It is all too possible for those who "offer before the Lord" to die a spiritual death, because they lose all real and living appreciation of the things they say and do. There is a subtle but powerful tendency in the human mind to do mechanically and unintelligently that with which it is exceedingly familiar. Not even the most sacred words or solemn rites are proof against it. We may, at the desk, or pulpit, or even at the table of the Lord, take words upon our lips which find no answer in the soul. We may be obnoxious to our Lord's reproach (Matt. xv. 8). To use sacred language without sacred feeling is to move away from the fountain of life; to have entered the precincts of habitual formalism is to have passed the outer portals of the kingdom of death.

**III. DISOBEDIENCE FROM DISREGARD TO THE WILL OF GOD.** We are not bound to a rigid correspondence with every minute New Testament practice. There are some matters in which changed circumstances demand other methods. But we are bound to search the Scriptures to find the will of our Lord in the worship we render and the work we do for him. If we follow nothing better than "the traditions of men," or our own tastes and inclinations, we may find ourselves in the wilderness—a long way from the water of life.

Whatever position we occupy in the Church of Christ, however much of "the honour that cometh from man" we may enjoy, it is essential that we: 1. Cherish the spirit of humility, and exercise a living faith in Jesus Christ. 2. Realize the truth we speak, and spiritually participate in the services we conduct. 3. Have supreme regard to the will of our Master, seeking to learn that will as devoutly, patiently, studiously, as we can. These things must we do "that we die not" before the Lord.—C.

**Vers. 2—17.—*Type and antitype—the priest.*** The high priest offering sacrifices for the sin of the people was a clear type of "the High Priest of our profession," who offered the one sacrifice for sin, who became the Propitiation for our sin, even for the sins of the whole world (1 John ii. 2). We have—

**J. FOUR FEATURES OF RESEMBLANCE.** 1. Aaron acted under Divine direction. He was appointed by God to take the post he took, and was charged to do everything he

did. He might not deviate in any particular from the instructions which came from heaven. "Aaron shall" is the continually recurring strain; almost every other verse contains this formula; departure from direction was utter failure in his work and death to himself (ver. 2). 2. Aaron divested himself of his rich attire—he wore not the ephod with precious stones, nor the mitre glittering with golden crown; this splendid attire he laid by on this occasion, and he put on the simple linen coat, and was girded with a linen girdle, and wore a linen mitre (ver. 4). 3. Aaron did his priestly work alone. "There shall be no man in the tabernacle when he goeth in . . . until he come out" (ver. 17). No other foot but his might enter within the veil; no other hand but his might sprinkle the blood on the mercy-seat. 4. Aaron bore a heavy burden for the people. "So laborious and trying was his work that, after it was over, the people gathered round him with sympathy and congratulation that he was brought through it in safety." So Christ, the great antitype, (1) was appointed of God (Heb. v. 4, 5); he was "the Anointed," the Sent One; he "came to do his Father's will," and though under no such minute commandments as those which regulated the actions of Aaron, he was ever consulting the will of the Father, doing "nothing of himself" (John v. 19—30; viii. 28; ix. 4). (2) Divested himself of the robe of his divinity, and put on the frail garment of our humanity (John i. 14; Heb. ii. 14; Phil. ii. 7). (3) "Trod the winepress alone." "Ye shall leave me alone," said he (John xvi. 32). and alone he agonized in the garden, and alone he suffered and died on the cross. His was a most lonely life, for not even his most loved disciple understood the meaning of his mission; and his was a lonely death, none of those who stood weeping by being able to take any part in the sacrificial work he then wrought out. (4) Bore so heavy a burden for us that his heart broke beneath it.

II. THREE POINTS OF CONTRAST. 1. Aaron was compelled to present offerings for himself (vers. 6, 11—14). 2. Had to present an offering that was provided for him; a bullock had to be brought from the herds of Israel (ver. 6), or he would have been a priest without an offering. 3. Could offer no availings sacrifice for deliberate transgressions: presumptuous sin had already paid the penalty of death. But Christ Jesus, our Great High Priest, (1) needed not to present any sacrifice for himself; the holy, harmless, undefiled One, separate from sinners, did not need to offer up sacrifices first for his own sins (Heb. vii. 26, 27). (2) Had no need to procure a victim, for himself

" . . . came down to be  
The offering and the priest."

He appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself (Heb. ix. 26). (3) Offered a sacrifice which avails for all sin. His blood "cleanseth us from all sin" (1 John i. 7; 1 Cor. vi. 11; Eph. i. 7; Heb. ix. 14; vii. 25, etc.).—C.

Vers. 7—10, 15, 21, 22.—*Type and antitype—the offering.* The most striking feature of the whole service on the great Day of Atonement was the action of the high priest in regard to the two goats brought to the tabernacle door (ver. 7). They clearly point to that "Lamb of God" who came to "take away the sin of the world" (John i. 29). That there were two goats rather than one presents no difficulty at all; there might well have been more than one to typify the Sacrifice which they foreshadowed. We learn—

I. THAT GOD ADMITS VICARIOUS SUFFERING INTO HIS RIGHTEOUS REALM. The innocent goat would shed its blood, would pour out its life, that the guilty human souls might not die, but live. It was a Divine appointment, and shows clearly that the propitiatory element was allowed by the Holy One of Israel. The vicarious principle has a large place in the kingdom of God on earth. Involuntarily and also voluntarily we suffer for others and others for us. Man bears the penal consequences of his brother's sin. He does so when he cannot avoid so doing; and he does so frequently with his own full consent; indeed, by going far out of his way on purpose to bear it. Vicarious suffering runs through the whole human economy. But there is only One who could possibly take on himself the penalty of the world's sin—only One on whom could possibly be "laid the iniquity of us all." That one is the spotless "Lamb of God," that Son of God who became sin for man; he, "for the suffering of death was made a little lower than the angels," and took on him a mortal form. "Surely as

hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows ; . . . he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities," etc. (Isa. liii. 4, 5 ; 1 Pet. ii. 24).

**II. THAT THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST AVAILS TO REMOVE COMPLETELY ALL CONDEMNATION.** When the children of Israel saw the live goat, over whose head their sins had been confessed, being led away into the waste wilderness where it would never more be seen (ver. 22), they had a very vivid assurance made through their senses to their soul that "their transgressions were forgiven, and their sins covered." No such dramatic assurance have we now, but we may have the utmost confidence that our sins are forgiven us "for his Name's sake ;" that "there is no condemnation to us who are in Christ Jesus," to us "who have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins" (Acts xiii. 39 ; Rom. v. 9). Trusting in the slain Lamb of God, we may see, by the eye of faith, all our guilt and all our condemnation borne away into the land of forgetfulness, where God will remember it no more for ever.

**III. THAT NO SACRIFICE WILL AVAIL ANYTHING WITHOUT ACTIVE PARTICIPATION ON OUR PART.** Useless and unavailing altogether the slaying of the one goat and the sending away of the other without the act of confession and the imposition of hands by the high priest (ver. 21) ; this part of the solemn ceremonial was essential ; apart from that everything would have been vain. And without our personal spiritual participation the sacrifice of the Lamb of God will be all in vain. 1. There must be the confession of our sin ; a confession of sin which springs from contrition for sin, and is attended by a determination to put all sin away (repentance). 2. Faith in the Divine Redeemer. "Our faith must lay its hand on that dear head of his." 3. And this must be the action of our own individual soul. Whatever guidance and encouragement we may gain from the ministers of Christ, *we ourselves* must repent and believe.—C.

**Vers. 29-31.—*The great anniversary—sacred seasons.*** The Jews had other special days beside the Day of Atonement. They had their weekly sabbath, the new moon sacrifices, their festivals or "holy convocations" (ch. xxiii.), etc. But this was the "grand climacteric ;" there were "high days" during the year, but this was the day of the year to every devout Israelite. No other was comparable to it in solemnity and sacred importance. Several features of peculiar interest combined to raise it above all other occasions. 1. It was the one annual solemnity prescribed by the Law. 2. It was a day of perfect rest from labour (vers. 29, 31). 3. It was the one day of universal fasting enjoined or encouraged in the Law (vers. 29, 31). 4. It was a day of self-examination and spiritual humiliation (ver. 29). 5. On that day the high priest went perilously near to the manifested presence of God—then, and then only, entering within the veil, and standing in presence of the mercy-seat and the mysterious, awful Shechinah (ver. 12). 6. On that day unusual sacrifices were offered unto the Lord, and a striking spectacle witnessed by the whole camp, the live goat being led away into the wilderness (ver. 21). 7. Then, also, the people felt themselves in an unusually blessed relation to Jehovah—free, as at no other time, from all their sin ; they were "clean from all their sins before the Lord" (ver. 30). We may, therefore, well pronounce this the great anniversary of the Hebrew Church. It must have had hallowing influences in both directions of time : it must have been anticipated with interest and awe ; it must have left behind it sacred shadows of holy feeling—of unity, reverence, joy in God. The holding of this anniversary "by statute for ever" suggests to us—

**I. THAT IN CHRIST JESUS THE OBSERVANCE OF DAYS IS AN OPTIONAL THING.** There are valid grounds for believing that it is the will of Christ we should observe the Lord's day as the disciples of him who is "the Resurrection and the Life." But the enforcement of the observance of sacred days by statute binding on the Christian conscience is expressly disallowed (Gal. iv. 10, 11 ; Rom. xiv. 5, 6 ; Col. ii. 16).

**II. THAT IT IS WISE, AS A MATTER OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY, TO OBSERVE SOME ANNIVERSARIES.** God has, in his providential arrangements, made certain points to be regularly recurring. Time is so measured that we must be periodically reminded of interesting events. God put the lights in the firmament in order that they might not only "give light upon the earth," but that they might be "for signs and for seasons, and for days and for years" (Gen. i. 14). 1. A Church should observe : (1) the day of its institution, or (2) the day on which it was conscious of revival, or (3) any particular day which is, to itself, fruitful of sacred suggestions. 2. Individual Christian men may

observe (1) the last day of the old year, (2) the first day of the new year, (3) the anniversary of their birthday, or (4) the anniversary of the day which has the most hallowed associations to their mind,—the day of religious decision or that of reception into the visible Church of Christ.

III. THAT THERE IS A TWOFOLD USE WE MAY MAKE OF SUCH ANNIVERSARIES. 1. Solemn retrospect; with careful retracing of past experiences, free and full acknowledgment of God's goodness and our own manifold shortcomings, simple faith in the Divine promise of forgiveness through Christ. 2. Thoughtful forecast; with studious consideration of what may yet be done for the Master and mankind, devout re-consecration of self to the service of the Saviour, believing prayer for Divine guidance and guardianship through future years.—C.

Vers. 33, 34.—*The imperfect ritual and the All-sufficient Sacrifice.* If we place ourselves at the standpoint of a devout and inquiring Hebrew worshipper, we can suppose ourselves to ask, on the morning and evening of the Day of Atonement—

I. WHY THIS ANNUAL CEREMONY? Have not numerous sacrifices been presented all the year round without intermission? Have not daily offerings been laid on the altar, morning and evening? and double sacrifices every sabbath day? and special offerings every month? And have not the people been bringing their presentations, from flock and herd, as piety has dictated, or special circumstances have required, all through the seasons? Have not these "come up with acceptance" before the altar of Jehovah? Has not sin been atoned for? What need, then, of these annual solemnities, of this very special ceremony at the tabernacle?

And if to such reflecting worshipper it should occur that the blood of lambs and bullocks, of doves and pigeons, was no real substitute for the forfeited life of men, would he not take a further step in his inquiry, and ask—

II. CAN THIS SUFFICE, ALL OTHER FAILING? What is there in the ceremonies of this sacred day which will avail, if all the year's sacrifices are insufficient? Will the fact that one man will stand in the inner instead of the outer side of a separating veil, and sprinkle blood on one article of tabernacle furniture rather than another,—will this make the difference between the adequacy and the inadequacy of animal sacrifice for human sin? Will the ceremony of slaying one goat and leading the other out into the wilderness constitute the one needful thing that is wanted to remove the guilt of a nation? Surely something more and something greater is wanted still. To these suggested and probable inquiries of the Hebrew worshipper, we reply—

III. THESE TYPICAL SOLEMNITIES DID NOT SUFFICE. It was a striking mark of their insufficiency that the very altar and tabernacle of the congregation, even the "holy sanctuary" itself (ver. 33; see ver. 16 and Heb. iv. 21), had to be "atoned for." Even they became affected by the "uncleanness of the children of Israel." Here was imperfection legibly written on the holy things. And our instructed reason tells us that these things were inherently unsatisfactory. "It is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins" (Heb. x. 4). Such "gifts and sacrifices could not make him that did the service perfect" (Heb. ix. 9; vii. 18, 19). They only served for a time, and drew their temporary sufficiency from the fact that they were to be completed and fulfilled in one Divine Offering, which should be presented in "the fulness of time." And thus we come to—

IV. THE ONE ALL-AVAILING SACRIFICE. In the one Great Sacrifice at Calvary, the death of the Lord Jesus Christ, there is everything which a guilty race requires. 1. No need, now, for annual sacrifices; "in those sacrifices there is a remembrance again made of sins every year" (Heb. x. 3). "But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever," etc., "by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified" (Heb. x. 14). Not "once a year," but once for all, once for ever! 2. No need for purifying the holy place. He hath passed into the heavens; has sat down at the right hand of God. The "uncleanness" of man cannot stain his throne of grace. 3. No question as to the efficacy of his atonement. "If the blood of bulls and of goats," etc. (Heb. ix. 13, 14). 4. No limit to the application of his atoning death. The cross of Christ is that on which not merely "all the people of the congregation" (ver. 33), but all human souls in every land and through every age may look, in which they may glory, at which they may leave their sin and fear, from which they may date their inextinguishable hope and their everlasting joy.—C.

## EXPOSITION.

## CHAPTER XVII.

This chapter finds its natural place here as the supplement of all that has gone before. The first part of the book contains the institution or regulation of the sacrificial system (chs. i.—vii.). This chapter, therefore, which gives injunctions as to the place where all sacrifices are to be offered, might well, as Knobel has remarked, have taken its place as ch. viii. The second part contains the institution of the hereditary priesthood (chs. viii.—x.). This chapter, therefore, which forbids for the future all offering of sacrifices in the open fields, and commands that they shall be brought "*unto the priest, unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation*," would still more fitly find its place after ch. x. But the first two sections of the third part (chs. xi.—xvi.) contain the laws and rules respecting cleansing from ceremonial defilement, and this cleansing is to be mainly effected by the means of sacrifice. Therefore the rule as to the place where sacrifice shall be offered is most naturally given here, where it is found (ch. xvii.), forming a close not only to Parts I. and II., but also to the two sections of Part III., which contain the regulations as to purification by sacrifice. It is altogether a mistake to make a Second Book begin with ch. xvii., as is done by Lange and Keil.

The first injunction contained in the chapter (vers 2-7) is very generally understood to mean that while the Israelites lived in the wilderness, all animals fit for sacrifices which were slain for food should be so far regarded as sacrifices that they should be brought to the door of the tabernacle and slain in the court, an offering of the blood and fat being made to the Lord. Thus the ordinary slaughtering of domestic animals, it is said, became sanctified, and the dignity of life made clear: God is the Lord of life; he gave it, and it must not be taken away unless the blood, which is the vehicle of life, be offered to him by being presented sacrificially on his altar, or, where this is not possible, as in the case of wild animals, by being reverently covered with earth. Such a rule as this respecting the slaughter-

ing of domestic animals, difficult to carry out in any case, would become impossible to obey after the camp had been expanded into a nation, and it is therefore supposed that it is by anticipation repealed in Deut. xii. 15 ("Notwithstanding thou mayest kill and eat flesh in all thy gates, whatsoever thy soul lusteth after, according to the blessing of the Lord thy God which he hath given thee"), while the regulations as to restricting the offering of sacrifice to the court of the temple, and as to pouring blood on the earth, are there emphatically enforced. This view of the text is erroneous, and must be rejected. The injunction does not refer to the ordinary slaughter of domestic animals for food, but only to sacrifices. Hitherto it had been the right and the duty of the head of each family to offer sacrifice for his household, and this he did wherever he thought proper, according to the ancient patriarchal practice, and most naturally in the open fields. This duty and liberty is now abolished. The Aaronic priesthood has superseded the older priestly system, and henceforth every sacrifice is to be offered in the court of the tabernacle, and by the hand of Aaron's sons. The change was most momentous, but it could not but be made after the consecration of Aaron and his sons for an hereditary priesthood. A second reason for the change being made was the immediate danger to which a rude and superstitious people was exposed, of offering the parts which they were bound to set aside for the altar of God to some other deity, if God's priests and altar were not at hand. The imaginations of the Israelites, corrupted by their stay in Egypt, peopled the fields with beings answering to the Pan and the satyrs of the Greeks; and to these the sacred portions of the animals slaughtered elsewhere than at the tabernacle were offered.

Ver. 8.—What man soever there be of the house of Israel, that killeth *an-ox*, or lamb, or goat. The use of the word *killeth*, instead of *sacrificeth*, is one of the chief causes of the error referred to above, which represents this command as applying to the slaughter of domestic animals. But it is always permissible to use a generic in place of a specific term, and its use proves nothing.

Probably the sacred writer uses it as a less sacred term, and therefore more suitable to sacrifices offered to the spirits of the fields and woods. If ordinary slaughtering were meant, there is no reason why pigeons and turtle-doves should not be added to the *ox*, or *lamb*, or *goat*. That every *ox*, or *lamb*, or *goat*, to be killed in the camp, or . . . out of the camp, for the food of more than 600,000 men, should be brought to so confined a space as the court of the tabernacle for slaughter, where the animals for the daily, weekly, annual, and innumerable private sacrifices were also killed, appears almost incredible in itself. How would the drivers have made their way into it? and what would have soon been the state of the court? It is true that animal food was not the staple sustenance of the Israelites in the wilderness; but not unfrequently, after a successful war or raid, there must have been a vast number of cattle killed for feasting or reserved for subsequent eating.

Ver. 4.—In case a man offers a sacrifice elsewhere than at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, . . . blood shall be imputed unto that man; that is, it shall no longer be regarded as a sacrifice at all, but an unjustifiable shedding of blood, for which he is to be cut off from among his people, that is, excommunicated.

Ver. 5.—To the end that the children of Israel may bring their sacrifices. This passage tells us the purpose of the previous command: it is to prevent sacrifices being sacrificed (the word is twice used in the original) in the open field, or anywhere else than in the court of the tabernacle. It follows that the command refers to sacrifice, not to mere slaughtering. Clark, taking the opposite view of the command, is obliged to change the translation, *sacrifices which they offer in the open field*, into "beasts for slaughter which they now slaughter in the open field" ('Speaker's Commentary'); but he has no authority for doing so. *Zabach* means always, in the Pentateuch, to slay in sacrifice. These field sacrifices, when offered to the Lord in the proper place and with the proper ceremonies, would become peace offerings unto the Lord.

Ver. 6.—The priest, that is, the Levitical priest, is henceforth to sprinkle the blood upon the altar of the Lord . . . and burn the fat for a sweet savour, which were the two parts of the sacrifice which were essentially priestly in their character. The old priestly function of the head of the family is disallowed.

Ver. 7.—And they shall no more offer their sacrifices unto devils, after whom they have gone a whoring. The word rightly translated *devils* means, literally, shaggy goats

(see 2 Chron. xi. 15; Isa. x.ii. 21; xxxiv. 14; where the word occurs). It is generally supposed that the Israelites borrowed their worship of the goat-like spirits of the woods and fields from Egypt. That goat-worship prevailed there in a very foul shape we know (Herod., ii. 42), but sacrifices in the open fields are rather a Persian habit (Herod., i. 132). Pan-worship, however, was common to most if not to all agricultural nations. The injunction which follows, *This shall be a statute for ever unto them throughout their generations*, which cannot be confined to the last few words or verses, shows that the command of ver. 3 refers to sacrifices, not to ordinary slaughtering. Had slaughtering been meant, the statute could not have been intended to be more than temporary in its obligation. The importance attributed to the regulation is further shown by the declaration previously made, that whoever transgressed it should be *cut off from among his people*, or excommunicated. In fact, it makes an era in the history of the chosen people. The old patriarchal priesthood having ceased, and the Aaronic priesthood substituted for it, the tabernacle is appointed to serve as a religious centre to the race. Whenever, from this time onwards, sacrifices were offered, without offence, elsewhere than in the court of the tabernacle or temple, as by Samuel (see 1 Sam. xiii. 8), and by Elijah (1 Kings xviii. 32), it was done by the direct order or dispensation of God.

Vers. 8, 9.—So essential is the regulation to the maintenance of the Israelitish polity, that it is extended to the *strangers* which *sojourn among them*, not confined to those who were of the *house of Israel*; and the penalty of excommunication is appointed for both classes alike in case of disobedience. It may be noticed that this verse assumes that burnt offerings and peace offerings are offered by the strangers that sojourn among them, as well as by the Israelites by race.

Vers. 10, 11.—The appointment made just above, that the blood of all animals slain in sacrifice should be offered to the Lord on his altar in the court of the tabernacle, leads naturally to a reiteration of the prohibition of the eating of blood, and a statement of the reason of that prohibition. "But flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall ye not eat," was given as a command to Noah (Gen. ix. 4). It has already been repeated twice in the Book of Leviticus (chs. iii. 17; vii. 26), and it is still again found in ch. xix. 26; Deut. xii. 16; xv. 23. The present is the *locus classicus* which explains the earnestness with which the rule is enforced. It begins with an extension of the obligation from the Israelites to the sojourners among them, and with a solemn declaration that, in case of trans-

gression, God will take into his own hands the punishment of the offenders; not only is he to be cut off or excommunicated by political or ecclesiastical authority, but God himself will set his face against that soul that eateth blood, and will cut him off from among his people, by death, or such means as he chooses to adopt. Then follows the reason for the prohibition. For the life of the flesh is in the blood. The blood may not be eaten because it is the vehicle of life, literally, the *soul of the flesh*, that is, it is the seat of the animal life of the body. "It is the fountain of life," says Harvey: "the first to live, the last to die, and the primary seat of the animal soul; it lives and is nourished of itself, and by no other part of the human body." In consequence of possessing this character, it is to be reserved, to make an atonement for your souls upon the altar; for thus only blood became qualified for the purpose of atonement. The clause, for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul, should be translated, *for the blood maketh atonement by means of the soul*, i.e. by means of the life which it contains. It is because the blood is the vehicle of the animal's life, and represents that life, that it serves to cover, or make atonement for, the soul of the offerer of the sacrifice, who presents it instead of his own life.

Ver. 12.—This verse emphatically restates that the atoning power of the blood, as being the seat of life, is the reason that the eating of it is forbidden, and the same statement

is repeated in a different connexion in ver. 14.

Vers. 13, 14.—Negatively, it has been ordered that blood shall not be eaten; positively, that it is to be offered to God. But there may be cases where the latter command cannot be carried out, as when animals are killed in hunting. On such occasions the man who kills the animal, whether he be an Israelite or a sojourner, is to pour out the blood thereof, and cover it with dust, regarding it as a sacred thing.

Vers. 15, 16.—There is still another possible case. The blood of an animal may not have been shed, or not shed in such a way as to make it flow abundantly, as when the animal has died a natural death, or been killed by wild beasts. In this case, as the blood still remains in the body, the flesh may not be eaten without defilement. The defilement may be cleansed by the unclean man washing his clothes and bathing, but if he neglect to do this, he shall bear his iniquity, that is, undergo the consequence of his transgression, which he would not have undergone had he been ceremonially cleansed (cf. Exod. xxii. 30; ch. xi. 39; Deut. xiv. 21). The prohibition of the eating of blood was continued by the Council of Jerusalem, but the observance of the regulation was no longer commanded as a duty binding on all men, but as a concession to Jewish feelings, enabling Jewish and Gentile converts to live together in comfort (see 1 Sam. xiv. 32; Ezek. xxxiii. 35; Acts xv. 20).

#### HOMILETICS.

Vers. 1-9.—*Sacrifice is not in itself enough*; there must be uniformity in the manner in which it is offered, and identity of place in which it is made. The seven first chapters of the Book of Leviticus have given a minute statement of the ceremonies which are always to be unfailingly observed. Incidentally, it had been taught in these chapters that the place of sacrifice was the court of the tabernacle, but now every other place of sacrifice is stringently forbidden.

I. THE TABERNACLE AND AFTERWARDS THE TEMPLE WERE THE CENTRE OF THE JEWISH CHURCH, AND THEREFORE OF THE JEWISH STATE. Every community which is to be permanent must have a central idea, and that idea must be embodied in some formula, or still better in some institution. The tabernacle or the temple was such an institution to the Jew. It summed up in itself, and was the symbol to the Jew of all that he valued. It was the rallying point of the nation, the thing that each citizen was willing to live for and die for, whatever other differences might divide him from his fellows. This gave a strength and unity to the different tribes, which would otherwise have probably all fallen apart, and though it was not strong enough to prevent the great schism, Jeroboam's plan of supplying its place by an unreal substitute showed its force; it survived the destruction of the material temple by Nebuchadnezzar, preserved the exiled fragments of the nation during the Captivity, and inspired courage to return to Jerusalem and rebuild what they had lost. Nay, even now its memory keeps together the scattered members of a dispersed nation, and forms them into one people.

**II. THE TABERNACLE OR TEMPLE WAS THE EFFECTIVE SIGN OF UNITY TO THE JEWS BECAUSE IT CONTAINED THE ARK.** The ark was the visible symbol of the presence of God among his chosen people. Therefore the hearts of the people went out towards the sanctuary with adoration and love. Therefore all the sacrificial rites had to be performed before the door of the sanctuary, not only while they lived in the wilderness, but when they were settled in Canaan. The journeys up to Jerusalem at the three great festivals intensified their love for the temple, and made them feel their union and communion with one another and with God. Nor did the institution of synagogues throughout the land interfere with this feeling, as the worship conducted in them was recognized as being of an inferior description to that which could be celebrated at the temple alone. The temple was, in the estimation of the Jew, the local abiding-place of God upon earth. Even when the ark and the mercy-seat were gone, it retained this character above every other spot.

**III. THE IDEA OF A LOCAL PRESENCE OF GOD IN ANY GIVEN PLACE ON EARTH IS ABOLISHED.** "Believe me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father. . . . the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship him. God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth" (John iv. 21—24). "For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same my Name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense shall be offered unto my Name, and a pure offering: for my Name shall be great among the heathen, saith the Lord of hosts" (Mal. i. 11). There is no local or material centre to the Christian Church; no one city holy because it contains the temple; no one temple holy because it contains the visible presence of God; no one high priest on earth holy because alone privileged to enter into that presence. The spiritual has superseded the material.

**IV. THE UNITY OF THE CHRISTIAN BODY IS TO BE OTHERWISE MAINTAINED.** Its unity is commanded and prayed for by Christ: "Holy Father, keep through thine own Name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one, as we are." "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: . . . that they may be one, even as we are one: I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one" (John xvii. 11, 20—23). And it is enjoined by the apostle, "Endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace" (Eph. iv. 3). So far and at such times as Judaical and materializing views have prevailed in the Church, attempts have been made to preserve this unity in the Jewish manner, by making an earthly head of the Church, round which the members might gather.

**V. THE TRUE BONDS OF UNITY IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.** 1. The common possession of the "one Spirit" (Eph. iv. 4), who unites all the members by the internal cohesion of unanimity and love. 2. The common possession of the "one Lord" (Eph. iv. 5), the invisible Head of the body, from whom there flows down into the members a life shared by all alike. 3. The common possession of the "one God and Father of all" (Eph. iv. 6), whose Fatherhood makes us all brethren. 4. The common possession of "one faith" (Eph. iv. 5), "once (for all) delivered to the saints" (Jude 3). 5. The common possession of "one hope" (Eph. iv. 4) of eternal life. 6. The common possession of "one baptism" (Eph. iv. 5), by which we were made members of the "one body" (Eph. iv. 4). 7. The common possession of the other sacrament appointed to continue "till he come" (1 Cor. xi. 26). 8. The common possession of the ministry instituted "for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ: . . . that we may grow up into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ" (Eph. iv. 12—15).

**VI. THE NATIONALITY AND INDEPENDENCE OF CHURCHES NOT INCOMPATIBLE WITH CATHOLIC UNITY.** If there were one visible head of the Church on earth, or one divinely constituted earthly centre of Christendom, there could be no such thing as an independent or a National Church. But this conception of the Church Catholic, partly Judaical, partly feudal, is wholly false. The possession of the above-named qualifications makes a particular Church partaker in Catholic unity, the ideal Christian Church consisting of a federal union of such Churches in union and communion one with

another, agreeing in their belief, but not necessarily uniform in their ceremonies and rites (Art. XXXIV.).

Vers. 10-13.—*The eating of blood is strictly prohibited*; therefore our Lord's words must have sounded so much the more strange in the ears of the Jews, when he said, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you" (John vi. 53). The reason why blood may not be eaten is that the life of the flesh is its blood (ver. 11). Eating the blood was the same thing as eating the life of the animal. Therefore his Jewish auditors would understand our Lord to mean by the words, "Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day" (John vi. 54), that whoso became a partaker of his life, would thereby become a possessor of eternal life, and, possessing that, would share in its privileges—resurrection and immortality (see Wordsworth, *ad loc.*) There is an eating and drinking of Christ's flesh and blood, that is, a partaking of his life and Spirit, which may be accomplished without any outward act whatever; but no doubt a special method of performing this mysterious act was instituted when "Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins" (Matt. xxvi. 27, 28). It may well be questioned whether a Church which forbids its members to drink of that cup does not shut them out from a full partaking of the life of Christ, so far as that blessing is imparted by that ordinance.

#### HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

*Grace before meat.* Ch. xvii.; cf. 1 Cor. x. 31. From the perfect atonement God provides, we are invited next to turn to the *morality* he requires. And no better beginning can be made than the acknowledgment of God in connection with our food. The beautiful way the Lord secured his own recognition as the bountiful Giver was by enacting that blood, since it is the means used in atonement, must be devoted to no meaner use. Hence it was to be carefully put away, either by the priest at the tabernacle, or by the huntsman in the dust of the wilderness, and the animal used as a peace offering before God (ver. 5). What we have consequently in this chapter is the *religious use of food*, or, as we have put it, "Grace before meat." In this connection let us observe—

I. THAT GOD HAS IMPLANTED SOME MEMENTO OF HIMSELF IN ALL OUR FOOD. Vegetable as well as animal life, of which we are reminded at every meal, is the sign manual of the living God. It is worse than stupidity not to recognize in the food we eat the gifts of his bounteous hand. "Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning" (Jas. i. 17). Why personify nature into a giver as a mere subterfuge for gross ingratitude? The Divine hand is behind the whole, and an honest heart can see it and will bless it as the source of all!

II. GOD REMINDS US AT EVERY MEAL OF ATONEMENT AS THE PRELIMINARY TO PEACE AND FELLOWSHIP. For all our food once thrilled with organic life. There is literally the sacrifice of life, vegetable and animal, in every meal. Vegetarians sacrifice microscopic life, after all their efforts to sacrifice nothing but vegetable life. Thus our race is reminded of the first principle of atonement, every time we sit down at the table which a bounteous providence has spread. In fact, it is our own fault if every feast be not in a certain sense sacramental. The Supper of the New Testament, as well as the Passover of the Old, embodies the sacrifice of life in order to the support of man. It is on this principle that the world is constituted. If, then, we listened to the voice of Nature as we ought to do, we would hear her calling in every feast for the grateful recognition of that principle in atonement to which we have referred. Peace and communion are really based in the order of nature upon the sacrifice of life. "Vicarious

sacrifice" is a principle of vast range, and the atonement of Jesus is but a single application of it.

III. THE RECOGNITION OF GOD IN EVERY PLEASURE WILL MAKE IT DOUBLY DELIGHTFUL. It is evident that God contemplated hunting as something which might be enjoyed religiously. The blood of the animal was to be carefully covered with dust in the hunting-field. Such a recognition of God may be carried into all legitimate enjoyment. As Charles Lamb suggests saying grace before entering upon new books, as something more fitting than a formal grace before gluttony, let us by all means carry the good custom into everything. We may develop our muscular powers in a religious spirit. Let us have religion in bodily exercise, religion in our social enjoyments, religion in business, religion in politics, religion in all things. "Whether ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." We should recognize a "muscular Christianity," and a mercantile Christianity, and a Christianity "which doth not behave itself unseemly" in society; in a word, the adaptability of the religious spirit to all lawful relations. The sooner we recognize and realize this, the better.—R. M. E.

Vers. 1—16.—*Statutes concerning blood.* The sacredness of blood is everywhere marked in Scripture. The chapter before us contains some of the more important statutes concerning it.

I. IN RESPECT TO THE BLOOD OF SACRIFICE. 1. *It must be brought to the door of the tabernacle.* (1) This requisition does not apply to animals ordinarily killed for food (comp. Deut. xii. 15, 21). (2) It applies to the blood of sacrifices. (a) To the blood of those offered at the door of the tabernacle. As a matter of course, the blood of such sacrifices would be sprinkled and poured out at the altar. (b) To the blood of those also offered outside the camp (vers. 3, 5). Sacrifices were formerly offered wherever the providence of God might indicate (Gen. xii. 8; Job i. 5). God still reserved to himself the right to sanction the offering of sacrifices where he pleased (see Judg. vi. 26; xiii. 19; 1 Sam. vii. 9; 2 Sam. xxiv. 18; 1 Kings xviii. 23). Without such sanction, the altar of the tabernacle is the one place appointed for the shedding of sacrificial blood. (3) Public worship is encouraged by this law (Heb. x. 25). 2. *The penalty of disobedience is excision.* (1) The statute was enacted to prevent idolatry. Sacrificing elsewhere, they might be tempted to sacrifice to devils (ver. 7). The heathen thought the spirit of their god resided in his idol; such spirits are here called "devils." All idolatry is from Satan, and is devilish (1 Cor. x. 20). The word (אַתָּתְבָּשׁ) here translated "devils" is elsewhere rendered "goats." Perhaps the idols in which these spirits of devils were supposed to reside were of the goat-like form. Goats were worshipped in Egypt, and probably also in Canaan. (2) Blood is imputed to him that sheds blood in sacrifice elsewhere than at the altar of the tabernacle (ver. 4). To bring the blood to the door of the tabernacle taught the worshipper to discern Christ, through whose blood we enter heaven. To miss this lesson was to degenerate into abominable and fatal idolatry (see Isa. lxvi. 3). This law applied to proselytes as well as to native Israelites (vers. 8, 9). There is but one way to God for the Jew and Greek (Rom. iii. 30). "He that believeth not shall be damned" (see ver. 4).

II. IN RESPECT TO FOOD. 1. *Blood as food is absolutely forbidden.* (1) The prohibition is among the Noachian precepts. He who reserved the tree of knowledge of good and evil in his grant of vegetables to man for food, reserved blood in his grant of animals (Gen. ix. 4, 5). Being a Noachian precept, this law is obligatory upon the human family at large. (2) The prohibition of blood was formally incorporated into the Levitical code (see ver. 10; also chs. iii. 17; vii. 26; Deut. xii. 25). The abrogation of the Levitical Law, however, does not repeal the Noachian precept. Unless, therefore, it can be shown that the Noachian precept is abrogated, it is still unlawful both to Jew and Gentile to eat blood. (3) So far from being repealed, this precept is re-enforced under the gospel (Acts xv. 28, 29). This "burden" our Lord still lays upon the Churches, even after the destruction of Jerusalem (see Rev. ii. 14—24). The significance of this term "burden" must not be overlooked (comp. Acts xv. 28 with Rev. ii. 24). 2. *Two reasons for the prohibition are assigned.* These are: (1) That "the life of the flesh is in the blood." This is philosophically true. Cut a nerve, you paralyze a member, but it lives; cut off the blood, the member mortifies. Blood flows to a wound, becomes vascular there, knits the living parts, and it heals. The vitality of the blood is seen

in its power of maintaining its temperature against the extremes of heat and cold. The lesson of this reason is to teach us the value of life. Hence in connection with the Noachian precept prohibiting the eating of blood, we have also the law guarding the life of man by the penalty of death to the murderer. (2) That "it is the blood that maketh an *atonement* for the soul" (ver. 11). That should not be treated as a common thing which is the principle of atonement, and the type of the precious blood of Christ. (3) For these reasons also things strangled are forbidden, things which died alone, or were torn; things not so killed as to let the blood properly flow from them. Thus the slaying of every animal used for food in the sacrificial way would remind the eater of the necessity of sacrifice for sin (see 1 Cor. x. 31). 3. *The penalty here also is excision.* (1) If things strangled were eaten, the transgressor became unclean (see 1 Sam. xiv. 32, 33). He must wash his clothes, for his profession hath been polluted. He must wash his flesh, for his person is defiled. If he neglect this repentance and purification, he shall bear his iniquity; he is obnoxious to excision (ver. 16; ch. v. 17; Numb. ix. 13). (2) What, then, can be said for a Church which professes literally to drink the blood of Christ in the cup of the Mass? Is not that Church thereby guilty of outraging the law of all the dispensations? It would evade this impeachment by impudently authorizing the eating of blood. But no impudence can evade the penalty: "But flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall ye not eat. And surely your blood of your lives will I require." Does not this plainly say that God will require the blood of the life of the blood-eater? David abhors the practice of the Syrians, who made libations of blood to their gods, and prophetically denounces and rejects our antichristian idolaters (see Ps. xvi. 4). Drunk as she is with the blood of the saints and the martyrs of Jesus, God will give her blood to drink, for she is worthy.

—J. A. M.

Vers. 1—7.—*One place of sacrifice.* It is of the essence of law to be impartial. Its precepts apply to all without distinction. "Aaron and his sons and all the children of Israel" are here included in the scope of the Divine commands. Let none deem himself too humble or too exalted to incur displeasure by infraction of the Law.

I. We see that **A LAWFUL ACTION MAY BE UNLAWFULLY PERFORMED.** A wrong time or place may vitiate a deed otherwise permissible. Animals were given to man as food, and to slaughter and eat them was not in itself sin, but after the issue of this prohibition it became sin to do so without presenting them at the tabernacle. "Blood shall be imputed unto that man; he hath shed blood." So the homicide justifiable in war becomes murder, and the intercourse of matrimony fornication, and the "word spoken in season" a casting of pearls before swine, by reason of impropriety of person or season.

II. **THE PEOPLE OF GOD MUST EXPECT RESTRICTIONS TO BE PLACED UPON THEIR LIBERTY.** The nations may follow their own devices and desires, the chosen people are under a covenant to obey the commands of the Legislator. They are assured that his wisdom and kindness will prevent the adoption of unnecessary and inequitable prohibitions. For all his precepts there are the best possible reasons, and therefore obedience is cheerfully rendered. Note the noble reply which Milton puts into the mouth of the seraph Abdiel, to the taunts of Satan ('Paradise Lost,' bk. vi. 170—181). Whilst the Israelites were in the wilderness, and the tabernacle abode in the midst of the camp, no hardship was involved in attending to this injunction, and it restrained them from evil practices, disciplining them against the time that they should enter the land of promise and have the injunction removed. Besides, animal food was scarce in the wilderness, as we learn from the complaints of the people.

III. **TO RECOGNIZE GOD IN OUR COMMON ACTIONS AND ENJOYMENTS HALLOWS LIFE—MAKES IT A RELIGIOUS SERVICE.** The slain animal is consecrated as a peace offering, its blood being sprinkled on the altar, the fat burnt for a "sweet savour unto the Lord," and the remainder partaken of with gratitude and joy. God is honoured and man profited. Alas! that so many can continually receive God's mercies without acknowledgment, no blessing invoked, and no emotion of holy gladness sweetening the repast! The Christian ideal is to do all in the Name of Jesus and to the glory of God.

IV. **TO REFUSE TO GOD HIS RIGHTS IS TO COMMIT IDOLATRY.** The Israelites were certain to turn the slaughter of an animal into a festival, and the question was, to whom

should the feast be dedicated? Homage to the demons of the field could not be sanctioned, it was a breach at once of the first and seventh commandments. It is frequently forgotten that a neutral attitude in respect of God is impossible; we are either on his side or against him. Intellectualism, materialism, scientificism, agnosticism, it matters not by what name our rejection of the claims of religion is covered, it really designates the setting up of an idol upon the throne of the heart, and we adore the enemy of God.

V. THE PROBATIONARY CHARACTER OF MANY OF GOD'S REQUIREMENTS IS HERE MADE VISIBLE. In Deut. xii. the precept of the text is repealed as relating to the settled condition of life in Palestine, when it would manifestly be difficult to comply with the law. By that period the precept had served its purpose in training the Israelites to abstain from evil practices, and to honour Jehovah with all their substance. And we to-day have our wilderness system of probation and training, many rules designed to meeten us for the society of just men made perfect. The injunction of the text pointed to the transitory nature of the Law as a whole. It has been abrogated by the gospel, the dispensation of promise, the land of liberty and rest. Yet, as in their residence in Palestine, the Israelites continued to observe the spirit of the repealed Law, so do we, under the gospel, retain the principles that underlay the Mosaic legislation. To acknowledge God in every meal and mercy, to hallow the secular and to promote it to the sacred, this, as it is the object of Christian endeavour, is the spirit of the command we have been considering in Leviticus. And equally so, the principles and spirit of our Christian earthly life will be recognizable in the higher worship and service of heaven. The accident changes, the essence alters not.—S. R. A.

Vers. 1—7.—*Features of Christian service.* It is open to question whether the prohibition (vers. 3, 4) extends to all animals killed for food, or only to those slain in sacrifice. The former view is, in my judgment, the correct one; for (1) the instruction is explicit enough (vers. 3, 4), and without qualification; (2) the limitation is afterwards allowed in consideration of the change of circumstance (Deut. xii. 20, 21); and (3) the difficulty in the case is less on consideration than it at first appears. It is objected that this would be a burdensome prohibition; but (a) it only lasted (see above) while they were in the camp, near to one another, and all near to the tabernacle; and (b) much less flesh was eaten there and then than is eaten here and now. A more largely vegetable diet would probably be wholesome for us; it was undoubtedly so in the desert of Arabia. When we more carefully consider this precept, we see its beneficent character; we perceive—

I. A FATAL EVIL, FROM WHICH IT WAS DESIGNED TO SAVE THEM. The practices of Egypt clung to them; among these was demon-worship (ver. 7). They had gone after those demons, and offered sacrifices to them. If any animal might be killed anywhere for food, and the blood of it might not be eaten (chs. iii. 17; vii. 26), there would be a strong temptation to the superstitious to pour it out in sacrifice to those demons of whose malignant interposition they were afraid. This temptation must, at all cost, be guarded against. It would introduce or foster that idolatrous usage from which it was the supreme object of all these statutes to keep Israel free. And if no animal might be slain save at the tabernacle door, there would be no danger of this disastrous lapse into Egyptian superstition.

II. THE GOOD IT WAS DESIGNED TO DO THEM. It would confer a threefold boon upon them. 1. It would bring them often to the tabernacle, and so to the near presence and worship of God; it would multiply their sacrifices (vers. 5, 6). 2. It would lead them to associate their material blessings with the Divine hand; presenting them unto the Lord, they could not fail to be reminded that they were his gifts. 3. It would help them to look on Jehovah as their Divine Friend. These became peace offerings (ver. 5), and the essential thought of such offering was human fellowship with God.

We detect here some useful suggestions as to the true character of Christian service. 1. *We must not make our Christian worship too deprecatory in its character.* There is something painfully and dangerously like demon-worship in the devotion of some men; they seldom rise above the deprecatory in their thought, as if God were a being so stern and so reluctant to forgive that his people should spend all their devotional breath in deprecating his wrath. Surely to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus

Christ we should bring, beside this, our adoration, praise, gratitude, trust, love, consecration, etc. 2. *We must learn to connect daily blessings with the Divine hand.* We should, in thought though not in act, bring everything we have to "the door of the tabernacle," trace each good thing we enjoy to the generous Giver of all, to his heart of love as well as to his hand of bounty. 3. *We should bless God for revealing himself to us as our Divine Friend, in the person of Jesus Christ.* Jesus Christ has taught us to think and feel that we are the friends and guests of God (John xv. 14, 15; xiv. 23; Rev. iii. 20).—C.

Vers. 10-16.—*Atoning death.* We have here a repetition of a law which had already been twice delivered (chs. iii. 17; vii. 23-26). Its full and formal restatement is very significant, and this the more because of the emphatic utterance of Divine displeasure in the event of disobedience. "I will even set my face against that soul . . . and will cut him off," etc. (ver. 10). Obviously, the highest importance was attached by God to the observance of this injunction not to eat "any manner of blood." We regard—

I. **THE PRIMARY SIGNIFICANCE OF THIS LAW.** This is clearly indicated in vers. 11 and 12. We shall understand it if we consider the subject thus: 1. Happy and harmonious relations between Jehovah and his people were maintained by continual sacrifices at his altar. 2. In these sacrifices the life of the slain animal was accepted by God as an atonement for the forfeited life of the human transgressor. 3. But the blood of the animal was regarded as the seat and source of its life. When its blood was shed its life was taken, and the shed blood was sprinkled before the vail or poured on the altar (ch. ii. 6, 7), as standing for the life which had been offered by man, and been accepted by God. "The blood of bulls and of goats," therefore, however insufficient of itself for the high purpose of atonement for human sin, was yet the outward and visible means which the Holy One of Israel was pleased to appoint for reconciliation between himself and his people. Therefore it was to be held sacred; the idea of it must not be vulgarized, as it would inevitably be if blood were used as common food at ordinary meals. Its sanctity must be carefully fenced. Men must associate with it, in their minds, nothing but the forfeited life, the atonement, with which it was so closely connected. All their domestic and social customs (vers. 13, 15, 16) must be so ordered that the blood of animals, anywhere and otherwise slain, should speak of those sacrifices at the altar in which the erring souls of men sought and found the mercy and the favour of their God.

II. **ITS SIGNIFICANCE TO OURSELVES.** It suggests to us the truth that, as the disciples of Jesus Christ, we also should count very sacred in our esteem the thought of atoning blood. 1. For we, too, are redeemed by "precious blood" (see 1 Pet. i. 18, 19; Eph. i. 7; Heb. ix. 12-14; Rev. v. 9). It may not have been needful that, in the literal sense, the blood of the Son of man should flow, but it was needful that his life, of which the blood is the source and the symbol, should be laid down. 2. Our Lord has given us a permanent institution, the object of which is to keep before our minds the shedding of his blood for our sins (Matt. xxvi. 28; 1 Cor. xi. 26). 3. By their words, he and his apostles laid the greatest stress on his atoning death as the source of our life and hope (John xii. 32; vi. 53; Luke xxiv. 46, 47; Heb. ix. 14; 1 John i. 7, etc.). 4. His atoning death was the object of our soul's trust when we entered our Christian course, and will be at the hour when we shall complete it. 5. It is the will of Christ that we should keep it continually in view throughout our life. It is our wisdom as well as our duty so to do, inasmuch as the contemplation of his death for our sins will minister (1) to our humility; (2) to our gratitude; (3) to a consecrated life of cheerful obedience and submission.—C.

Vers. 1-9.—*Sanctity of animal life.* All God's people commanded to observe restrictions as to the shedding of blood. Door of the tabernacle connected with the sphere of common life; thus religion and its duty threw sacredness over all things.

I. **THE DOMINION OF MAN OVER THE LOWER CREATION.** 1. *Appointed by God* (see Gen. i. 26 and Ps. viii.). 2. *Limited in its extent*, by necessity, humanity of feeling, provision for the higher purposes of human life. 3. *Capable of being blended with the Law of the sanctuary.* We should afford all creatures dependent on us, as much as

possible our own sabbath of bodily rest. We should make it a religious duty to protect them from injury and suffering. In so far as we use them for food, an offering of them should not be to the god of sensuality, but to him whose Law requires temperance, self-restraint, and reverence for the lower nature, that it may support the higher. All with thanksgiving.

II. POWER OF LIFE AND DEATH IS IN AND FROM GOD. As entrusted to man, whether over the lower animals or over his fellows, it is a power to be exercised as in the sight of God and at the door of his house. 1. Shedding of blood *a solemn responsibility*. In common life, lest we be guilty of cruelty and destruction of a true and valuable element in the world's welfare. In execution of law, lest we give to that which represents the Divine will the appearance of injustice and wantonness. Even in healthy sport, care must be taken lest there be an overbalance of the mind towards shedding of blood or disregard of suffering. In all questions of difficulty, bring the matter to the door of the tabernacle. 2. The sacredness of blood points to atonement. The devoted and slaughtered animal was received back again as a Divine gift for the use of the offerer, thus lifting up death into life. Sacrifice is not God's delight in death, but his promise of salvation. The sanctity attached to the blood of victims prepared the way to the higher sanctity attached to the blood of Christ. The Old and New Testaments explain one another.

III. PRESERVATION FROM IDOLATRY AND FALSE WORSHIP IN THE POSITIVE REGULATIONS OF THE LAW. Mistake of supposing that mere negative religion will purify men from corruption. Against the worship of devils we are never safe except as we are engaged in the worship of the true God.—R.

Vers. 10-16.—Ver. 11, “The life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul.”

I. THE NATURAL BASIS OF ATONEMENT. 1. The *preciousness* of life. The blood is the seat of life. 2. The exchange of the altar, blood for life, a lower for a higher, requires a *supplementary value*, which is represented by the altar itself. 3. *The law* proclaimed at the first against the shedding of blood taken up into the higher law of *redemption*; righteousness becoming at the altar of God the refuge of man.

II. ATONEMENT FOR THE SOUL PROVIDED BY DIVINE LOVE. “I have given it you to make an atonement.” 1. All atonement must proceed from Divine love, otherwise it will be heathenish as effecting a change in God. Christ is *set forth* a propitiation. 2. Atonement is *made*, i.e. by being offered, the blood shed at the tabernacle door, offered upon the altar. Thus the sacrifice is a revelation and consecration of the bond of union in the covenant relation between God and man. 3. The blood, while representing the life, also represents the obedience active and passive of Christ, which was both a rendering up to God of a perfect humanity, and an exaltation of the Law in the sufferings and death of Calvary; the old man crucified, the new man glorified. 4. All human merit is excluded: “*I have given it you*.” No amount of sacrifice would be of any avail except it be according to the will of God. We give back to him of his own. Hence the difference between the Jewish sacrifices and those of pagan nations, and between the morality which is founded on the sacrifice of Christ, and that which proceeds from mere self-will or an unjustifiable and false exaltation of human nature as it is. He that is not clean as God makes him clean shall “bear his iniquity.” Necessity of insisting on this doctrine of atonement in the present day. Falsehood as to humanity, in the way of all true progress. Those who boast are not those who make sacrifices to elevate man. “*Survival of the fittest*” a cruel remedy for the world's miseries. Christ's doctrine is elevation of the lowest. Atonement for your souls is the beginning of all true life.—R.

Ver. 11.—*The sanctity of the atoning blood.* No act was more strongly denounced than that of eating any manner of blood. The man guilty of that deed, whether an Israelite or a stranger sojourning in the land, was threatened with the displeasure of God and severest penalty. It seemed to partake of the nature of a ceremonial rather than a moral offence, yet it must be remembered that violations of ritual become moral transgressions when they are committed against the known will of the recognized

Legislator. This is especially the case when, as here, the Lawgiver condescends to explain the reason upon which the prohibition is founded. Such explanation ought to secure intelligent observance of the enactment. And that enactment was but the reissue of the former decree that gave animals to man for food, but annexed a prohibition against tasting the blood (Gen. ix. 4).

I. The fact stated, that **THE SHEDDING OF BLOOD CONSTITUTES AN ATONEMENT**. Illustrated by the numerous sacrifices of the patriarchs, and the provisions of the Law that sacrifices should form a part of all national and individual festivals, as well as of all offerings to wipe away inadvertent transgression. See it in the sprinkling of the book and vessels and people at the ratification of the covenant. It is confirmed by the well-nigh universal practice of heathen nations, and is proved by direct Scripture statements in the Old and New Testaments. "Without shedding of blood is no remission" (Heb. ix. 22). It typified, therefore, the offering of Jesus Christ, whose blood redeems us "from our vain manner of life" (1 Pet. i. 18). "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." This Mosaic way of speaking is ingrained in the apostles, showing how they regarded the death of Jesus as the fulfilment of the types of the Law.

II. The truth implied that **THE CHIEF VIRTUE OF BLOOD AS AN ATONEMENT IS DERIVED FROM GOD'S APPOINTMENT**. "I have given it unto you" indicates that the blood of animals had no intrinsic efficacy to atone for sin. And the same truth is shadowed forth in the words, "upon the altar." There was no difference in itself between blood ordinarily spilt and that presented before God, but the presentation constituted the difference. To sprinkle the blood upon the altar was to bring it emblematically into the very presence of the Deity. "God set forth" Christ Jesus "to be a propitiation, through faith, by his blood."

III. The reason afforded for the selection of **BLOOD**, that it is **THE VEHICLE OF LIFE**. Physiology, and especially recent investigations with the microscope, confirm the dictum of Scripture, that "the blood is the life." It nourishes and sustains the whole physical frame; if it deteriorate in quality the body weakens, if it diminish in quantity power is lessened. 1. By such an atonement *God is recognized as Lord of life* and of all its consequences. He gave and takes away, to him alone should life be offered. Thus the sanctity of life was enforced. Man was not to feast upon that which was God's prerogative; blood must be poured upon the ground like water, thus returning to the earth. 2. *The enormity of sin is represented*, as enacting the utmost for an atonement that can be rendered. "Life is the most cherished of possessions, since man is powerless to create or to restore it." The crowning proof of Christ's compassion was that he gave "his life" a ransom for the many, and the gift revealed the awfulness of sin to require such a redemption. 3. *It represents the substitution of one life for another*, death being the sentence pronounced upon the sinner. "When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin" was Isaiah's prediction of the sacrifice of Christ. It may be observed that the word in the text translated "soul" and "life" is the same, corresponding to the use made of the equivalent Greek word in Matt. xvi. 25, 26. That but for the death of Jesus Christ we must have been subject to eternal death, is the plain import of many passages in the Word of God.

IV. **THE FUTURE ADVENT TYPIFIED OF ONE WHO SHOULD BY HIS OFFERING FULFIL ALL THE CONDITIONS OF A PERFECT ATONEMENT**. Every Israelite might not perceive in the insufficiency of his sacrifices a prediction of the Lamb of God, but there it was portrayed visibly enough. An innocent, holy, human victim, a voluntary offering, being himself the Lawgiver, and by incarnation subjecting himself to the Law, making adequate acknowledgment of the righteousness of God and of the ill deserts of God's rebellious sinful children, revealing to man at once the loving heart of God and the hatefulness of sin which had estranged man from his Father in heaven, by his death exhibiting the length to which sin will go, and the willingness of Divine holiness and love to submit to extreme degradation and anguish in order that the curse might be removed and man's heart won,—this is the atonement of truest efficacy, a mighty moral power with God and man. This is the death that gives life to the world, the blood that cries out, not for vengeance, but for mercy, that sanctifies not merely to the purifying of the flesh, but to the purging of the conscience from dead works to serve the living God. And the shedding of the blood of Christ was the signal for release from

the ceremonies and restrictions imposed by the Mosaic Law. The prohibition of the text had served its purpose.

**CONCLUSION.** With what rejoicing should we approach our altar, the cross of Christ (Heb. xiii. 10)! And what guilt we incur if we slight the blood of Christ as little available for salvation, or, though professing to believe, yet by conduct show that we count the blood of the covenant an unholy thing!—S. R. A.

## PART III.

### SECTION III.

#### EXPOSITION.

##### CHAPTER XVIII.

###### MORAL UNCLEANNESS AND ITS PUNISHMENT.

This being the subject of the three following chapters (chs. xviii.—xx.), they naturally form a sequence to chs. xi.—xvi., which have dealt with ceremonial uncleanness and its purification. It is a remarkable thing that, except by implication in connection with the sin offerings and the trespass offerings and the ceremonies of the Day of Atonement, there has not yet been a single moral precept, as such, in the Book of Leviticus, and there has been very little recognition of sin as distinct from pollution. All has been ceremonial. But the ceremonial is typical of the moral, and from the consideration of ceremonial uncleanness and its remedy, we now proceed to the consideration of moral uncleanness and its penalty. It is to be noticed too that, while the ensuing laws are commanded as the positive injunction of God (vera. 2, 30), which of itself is sufficient to give them their authority and force, they are still founded, like the ceremonial prohibitions, upon the feelings of repugnance implanted in the mind of man. To enter into the marriage relation with near relatives is abhorrent to a sentiment in mankind so widely spread that it may be deemed to have been originally universal, and the same abhorrence is entertained towards other foul sins of lust. Ugliness, which creates disgust by its ugliness, symbolizes sin; immorality, which inspires abhorrence by its immoral character, proves itself thereby to be sin. The section deals first with sin in the marriage relation, next with sexual impurities connected with marriage, then with other cases of immorality, and

lastly with the penalties inflicted on these sins in their character of crimes.

Vera. 1—5 form an introduction to the Hebrew code of prohibited degrees of marriage and of forbidden sins of lust. The formal and solemn declaration, I am the Lord your God, is made three times in these five verses. This places before the people the two thoughts: 1. That the Lord is holy, and they ought to be like him in holiness; 2. That the Lord has commanded holiness, and they ought to obey him by being holy. Because the Lord is their God, and they are his people, they are, negatively, to refrain from the vicious habits and lax customs prevalent in the land of Egypt wherein they dwelt, and in the land of Canaan whither they were going, the sensuality of which is indirectly condemned by the injunctions which command purity in contrast to their doings; and, positively, they are to keep God's statutes, and his judgments, as laid down in the following code, which if a man do, he shall live in them. The latter clause is of special importance, because it is repeated in the same connection by Ezekiel (Ezek. xx. 11, 13, 21), and in the Levitical confession in the Book of Nehemiah (Neh. ix. 29), and is quoted by St. Paul in a controversial sense (Rom. x. 5; Gal. iii. 12). Its full meaning is that by obedience to God's commands man attains to a state of existence which alone deserves to be called true life—"the life which connects him with Jehovah through his obedience" (Clark). And this involves the further truth that disobedience results in death. Accordingly, St. Paul uses the text as being the testimony of the Law with regard to itself, that salvation by it is of works in contrast with faith. (Cf. Luke x. 28.) We have no evidence to tell us what were the *doings of the land of Canaan* in respect to the marriage relation, but this chapter is enough to show that the utmost laxity prevailed in it, and we may be sure that their religious rites, like those of Midian (Numb. xxv.), were penetrated

with the spirit of licentiousness. With regard to the *doings of the land of Egypt*, we have fuller information. We know that among the Egyptians marriage with sisters and half-sisters was not only permissible, but that its propriety was justified by their religious beliefs, and practised in the royal family (Diod. Sic. i. 27; Dio. Cass., xlii.). Other abominations condemned in this chapter (ver. 23) also, as we know, existed there (Herod., ii. 46), and if queens could be what in later times Cleopatra was, we may imagine the general dissoluteness of the people. Among Persians, Medes, Indians, Ethiopians and Assyrians, marriage with mothers and daughters was allowed, and from the time of Cambyses, marriage with a sister was regarded as lawful (Herod., iii. 31). The Athenians and Spartans permitted marriage with half-sisters. All these concessions to lust, and other unclean acts with which the heathen world was full (ver. 22; Rom. i. 27), were fallings away from the law of purity implanted in the heart of man and now renewed for the Hebrew people.

Ver. 6.—The next thirteen verses contain the law of incest, or the prohibited degrees of marriage. The positive law of marriage, as implanted in the human heart, would be simply that any man of full age might marry any woman of full age, provided that both parties were willing. But this liberty is at once controlled by a number of restrictions, the main purpose of which is to prevent incest, which, however much one nation may come to be indifferent to one form of it, and another to another, is yet abhorrent to the feelings and principles of mankind. The Hebrew restrictive law is contained in one verse. *None of you shall approach to any that is near of kin to him, to uncover their nakedness: I am the Lord.* All that follows (vers. 9—18) is simply an amplification and an explanation of the words, *near of kin to him*. These words would be literally rendered, *flesh of his flesh*, or less probably (as in the margin), *remainder of his flesh*. They certainly include within the compass of their meaning those that are near by affinity, as much as those that are near by consanguinity. This is proved by the instances given below, where no difference is drawn between blood relations and relations by marriage, the latter being supposed to become the former, in consequence of the marriage that has taken place. Nearness of kin is generally counted by “degrees;” but, unfortunately, this word is itself ambiguous, for it is used in different senses by canonists and by civilians. So far as the direct line is concerned, the same method of calculation is observed by the canon and by the civil law. There is one degree

from the son to the mother, two degrees to the grandmother; one degree from the father to the daughter, two degrees to the granddaughter. But this is not so with the collateral lines. A brother and sister, for example, are regarded by the canon law as in the first degree of kinship, because there is only one step to the father, in whom their blood meets; but the civil lawyers consider them as being in the second degree, because, as they calculate, there is one step from the brother to the father, and a second from the father to the sister. An aunt is, according to the canonists, in the second degree of propinquity, because there are two steps from her nephew to his grandfather, who is likewise her father, in whom their blood unites; but, according to the civilian's calculation, there are three steps, namely, from her nephew to his grandfather, two steps, and a third from that grandfather to his daughter the aunt; and therefore the aunt and nephew are in the third degree of propinquity. The case of an uncle and niece is exactly the same as that of a nephew and aunt. On the same principle, according to the canonists, first cousins are in the second degree of kinship; according to the civilians, in the fourth. Propinquity by affinity is calculated in just the same way; so that the brother's wife is in the same degree of relationship as the brother, and wife's sister as the sister by blood. In the code before us, confirmed by that in Deuteronomy, marriage is forbidden with the following blood relations: mother (ver. 7), daughter (ver. 17), sister (ver. 9; ch. xx. 17; Deut. xxvii. 22), granddaughter (ver. 10), aunt (vers. 12, 13; ch. xx. 19); and with the following relations by affinity: mother-in-law (ver. 17; ch. xx. 14; Deut. xxvii. 23), daughter-in-law (ver. 15; ch. xx. 12), brother's wife (ver. 16; ch. xx. 21), stepmother (ver. 8; ch. xx. 11; Deut. xxii. 30; see Gen. xl ix. 4; 1 Cor. v. 1), stepdaughter and step-granddaughter (ver. 17), uncle's wife, or aunt by marriage (ver. 14; ch. xx. 20); putting aside for the present the question of who is meant by a *wife to her sister*, in ver. 18. In these lists, according to the canonists' method of reckoning, the mother, the daughter, and the sister are related in the first degree of consanguinity; the wife's mother, the wife's daughter, the stepmother, the daughter-in-law, the brother's wife, are related in the first degree of affinity. The granddaughter and the aunt are in the second degree of consanguinity; the wife's granddaughter and the uncle's wife in the second degree of affinity. According to the civilians' reckoning, the following would be the degrees of propinquity:—The mother and the daughter would be in the first degree of consanguinity; the wife's mother, the

wife's daughter, the stepmother, the daughter-in-law, would be in the first degree of affinity. The sister and the granddaughter would be in the second degree of consanguinity; the brother's wife and the wife's granddaughter would be in the second degree of affinity. The aunt by blood would be in the third degree of consanguinity, and the uncle's wife, or aunt by marriage, would be in the third degree of affinity. The wife's sister, with regard to whom it is questioned whether she is referred to or not in ver. 18, is in the first degree of affinity (a man's wife being regarded as himself) according to the canonists' reckoning, and in the second according to the civilians'. There is no mention made in the code of the grandmother, the niece, and the cousin-german. All of these are in the second degree of consanguinity according to the canon law; and according to the civil law, the grandmother would be in the second degree, the niece in the third, and the cousin-german in the fourth. It may reasonably be supposed that by the expression, *None of you shall approach to any that is near of kin to him, to uncover their nakedness*, intercourse is forbidden between all those who are related by consanguinity or affinity in the first and second degrees according to the canonists' reckoning (except cousins-german, whose case is considered below); in the first, second, and third degrees according to the civilians' method of calculating; whether they are mentioned by name in the list or not. It is only by implication, not by direct injunction, that marriage even with a daughter is forbidden (ver. 17).

Vers. 7, 8.—Incest with a stepmother is placed next after that with a mother. On account of the unity caused by marriage ("they shall be one flesh," Gen. ii. 24), the stepmother's nakedness is the father's nakedness. The tie of affinity is thus declared to be similar in its effects to the tie of consanguinity. Reuben's sin, by which he forfeited his birthright, is connected with this offence, but is of a more heinous character, as his father was alive at the time of his transgression (Gen. xlix. 4). It is one of the sins which Ezekiel enumerates as those which brought the judgment of God on Israel (Ezek. xxii. 10). "That one should have his father's wife" is declared by St. Paul to be "such fornication as is not named among the Gentiles," and to call for the excommunication of the offender (1 Cor. v. 1—5). Adonijah's marriage with Abishag, so strongly resented by Solomon on political grounds, is not denounced as morally reprehensible, probably because Abishag was not the wife of David in such a way as to cause the marriage with his son to be abominable in the eye of the law (cf. 1 Kings i. 4 with Amos ii. 7). Absalom's "going in unto his father's

concubines" was regarded as the final act which made reconciliation with his father impossible (2 Sam. xvi. 22; xx. 3). The history of the Church has shown that marriage with the stepmother has had to be again and again prohibited by Council after Council (see Smith and Cheetham's 'Dictionary of Antiquities,' s.v. 'Prohibited Degrees').

Ver. 9.—In the third place, incest with a sister is forbidden, and it is specifically stated that under the term "sister" is meant the half-sister, the daughter of thy father, or . . . thy mother, . . . born at home, as would naturally be the case if she were the father's daughter, or born abroad, that is, the daughter of the mother by a previous marriage, when she belonged to a different household. Tamar's appeal to Amnon, "I pray thee speak unto the king; for he will not withhold me from thee," exhibits to us the poor woman grasping at any argument which might save her from her half-brother's brutality, and does not indicate that such marriages were, in the time of David, permissible (2 Sam. xiii. 29). The exact degree of relationship which existed between Abraham and Sarah is not altogether certain (cf. Gen. xx. 12 with xi. 29). Ezekiel reckons this sin in the catalogue of the iniquities of Jerusalem (Ezek. xxii. 11).

Ver. 10.—The fourth case of incest which is prohibited is that with a granddaughter, whether the daughter of son or daughter, for, as they are descended from the grandfather, their's is thine own nakedness.

Ver. 11.—Incest with a half-sister on the father's side is again forbidden. Perhaps "the prohibition refers to the son by a first marriage, whereas ver. 9 treats of the son by a second marriage" (Keil).

Vers. 12—15.—Fifthly, incest with a paternal or maternal aunt is forbidden; sixthly, with an aunt by marriage; seventhly, with a daughter-in-law. The last of these finds its place in Ezekiel's catalogue of abominations (Ezek. xxii. 11; cf. Gen. xxviii. 18, 26).

Ver. 16.—The eighth case of incest is intercourse with a brother's wife. Yet this is commanded under certain circumstances in the Book of Deuteronomy, and was practised in patriarchal times (Gen. xxviii. 8). The following are the circumstances under which it is commanded. "If brethren dwell together, and one of them die, and have no child, the wife of the dead shall not marry without unto a stranger; her husband's brother shall go in unto her, and take her to him to wife, and perform the duty of an husband's brother unto her" (Deut. xxv. 5). It has been asked, "How can the same thing be forbidden as immoral in Leviticus, and

commanded as a duty in Deuteronomy?" Bishop Wordsworth replies, "In a special case, for a special reason applicable only to the Jews, God was pleased to dispense with that law, and in the plenitude of his omnipotence to change the prohibition into a command. . . . God cannot command anything that is sinful. For sin is 'transgression of the Law' (1 John iii. 4), and whatever he commands is right. But it would be presumptuous to say that we may dispense with God's law concerning marriage, because he in one case dispensed with it; as it would be impious to affirm that murder is not immoral, and may be committed by us, because God, who is the sole Arbitrator of life and death, commanded Abraham to slay his son Isaac." The levirate marriage was not a concession to the desires of the second brother, but a duty enjoined for a family or tribal purpose, and it was plainly at all times most distasteful. Thus Onan refused to perform his duty to Er's wife (Gen. xxxviii. 9); the legislation in Deuteronomy anticipates objection on the part of the brother, and institutes an insulting ceremony to be gone through by him if he declined to do his duty to his dead brother (Deut. xxv. 9, 10), which we see carried out in some of its details in the case of Ruth's kinsman (Ruth iv. 7, 10). Indeed, in such a marriage, the second husband seems rather to have been regarded as the continuation of the first husband than as having a substantive existence of his own as a married man. He performed a function in order "that the name of his brother which is dead may not be put out of Israel" (Deut. xxv. 6), "to raise up the name of the dead upon his inheritance, that the name of the dead be not cut off from among his brethren" (Ruth iii. 10). The second husband's position may be compared to that of the concubine presented by Rachel to her husband. "Behold my maid Bilhah, go unto her; and she shall bear upon my knees, that I may also have children by her" (Gen. xxx. 8). The whole object of the rule was that, as the elder brother could not keep up the family by begetting an heir, the younger brother should do it for him after his death.

Ver. 17.—The ninth form of incest prohibited is intercourse with a stepdaughter, or step-granddaughter, or mother-in-law. The expression made use of, *Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of a woman and her daughter*, covers the case of a man's own daughter, and it is singular that it is only in this incidental manner that it is specifically named. But it has been already dispensed of by the general command, *None of you shall approach to any that is near of kin to him, to uncover their nakedness*. The

daughter being nearest of kin, this command was sufficient without further specification. The niece and probably the wife's sister are forbidden by the same general rule (see following note).

Ver. 18.—*Neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister, to vex her, to uncover her nakedness, beside the other in her life time.* Do these words refer to the marriage of two sisters or not? It has been passionately affirmed that they do, by those who are opposed to permission being granted for marriage with a deceased wife's sister, and by those who are in favour of that measure, each party striving to derive from the text an argument for the side which they are maintaining. But Holy Scripture ought not to be made a quarry whence partisans hew arguments for views which they have already adopted, nor is that the light in which a commentator can allow himself to regard it. A reverent and profound study of the passage before us, with its context, leads to the conclusion that the words have no bearing at all on the question of marriage with a deceased wife's sister, and thus it may be removed from the arena and atmosphere of angry polemics. It is certain that the words translated *a wife to her sister* may be translated, in accordance with the marginal rendering, *one wife to another*. The objections made to such a version are arbitrary and unconvincing. It is in accordance with the genius of the Hebrew language to take "father," "son," "brother," "sister," in a much wider acceptation than is the case in the Western tongues. Anything that produces or causes is metaphorically a "father;" anything produced or caused is a "son;" any things akin to each other in form, shape, character, or nature, are "brothers" and "sisters." This is the name given to the loops of the curtains of the tabernacle (Exod. xxvi. 3, 5, 6), the tenons of the boards (Exod. xxvi. 17), and the wings of the cherubim (Ezek. i. 11, 23). Indeed, wherever the expression, "a man to his brother," or "a woman to her sister," is used (and it is used very frequently) in the Hebrew Scriptures, it means not two brothers or two sisters, but two things or persons similar in kind. This does more than raise a presumption—it creates a high probability—that the expression should be understood in the same way here. But a difficulty then arises. If the right reading is, *Neither shalt thou take one wife to another*, does not the verse forbid polygamy altogether, and is not polygamy permitted by Exod. xxi. 7—11; Deut. xxi. 15—17; xvii. 17? Certainly, if so important a restriction was to be made, we should expect it to be made directly, and in a manner which could not be disputed. Is there any way out of

the difficulty? Let us examine each word of the Law. *Neither shalt thou take one wife to another, to vex, to uncover her nakedness upon her in her life time.* The two words, *to vex*, have not been sufficiently dwelt on. The Hebrew, *tearar*, means to distress by packing closely together, and so, to vex, or to annoy in any way. Here is to be found the ground of the prohibition contained in the law before us. A man is not to take for a second wife a woman who is likely, from spiteful temper or for other reasons, to vex the first wife. Rachel vexed Leah; Peninnah vexed Hannah; the first pair were blood relations, the second were not; but under the present law the second marriage would in both cases have been equally forbidden, if the probability of the provocation had been foreseen. It follows that polygamy is not prohibited by the text before us, but that the liberty of the polygamist is somewhat circumscribed by the application of the law of charity. It follows, too, that the law has no bearing on the question of marriage with a deceased wife's sister, which is neither forbidden nor allowed by it. Are we then to conclude that the Law of Moses leaves the case of the wife's sister untouched? Not so, for the general principle has been laid down, *None of you shall approach to any, that is near of kin to him, to uncover his nakedness*, and, as we have seen, the expression, *near of kin*, includes relations by affinity equally with blood relations; as therefore the wife's sister is in the canonists' first degree of affinity (and in the second according to the civilians), it is reasonably inferred that marriage with her is forbidden under the above law, and this inference is confirmed by marriage with the other sister-in-law—the brother's wife—being, as the rule, prohibited. It can hardly be doubted that marriage with the grandmother and with the niece—both in the second degree of consanguinity according to the canonists, and the third degree according to the civilians—and incest with a daughter are forbidden under the same clause.

The present verse completes the Levitical code of prohibited degrees. The Roman code of restrictions on marriage was almost identical with the Mosaic tables. It only differed from them by specifically naming the grandmother and the niece among the blood relations with whom a marriage might not be contracted, and omitting the brother's wife among relatives by affinity. In the time of Claudius, a change was introduced into it, for the purpose of gratifying the emperor's passion for Agrippina, which legalized marriage with a brother's daughter. This legalization continued in force until the time of Constantius, who made marriage with a niece a

capital crime. The imperial code and the canon law were framed upon the Mosaic and the Roman tables, and under them no question arose, except as to the marriage of the niece, the deceased wife's sister, and the first cousin. Marriage with the niece was forbidden by Constantius, as we have said, in the year 355, on penalty of capital punishment for committing the offence, and marriage with a deceased wife's sister was declared by the same emperor to be null. The canons of Councils and the declarations of the chief Church teachers are in full accordance with the imperial legislation, condemning these marriages without a dissentient voice. The only case in which no consensus is found is that of the marriage of first cousins. By the earliest Roman law these marriages had been disallowed (Tacitus, 'Annae,' xii. 6), but in the second century B.C. they had become common (Livy, xlii. 34), and they continued to be lawful till the year A.D. 384 or 385, when Theodosius condemned them, and made them punishable by the severest penalties possible. This enactment lasted only twenty years, when it was repealed by Arcadius, A.D. 404 or 405. No adverse judgment respecting the marriage of first cousins was pronounced by the Church until after the legislation of Theodosius, but it appears that that legislation was promoted at her instance, and from that time forward the tendency to condemn these marriages became more and more pronounced. See the canons of the Councils of Agde, Epaone, Auvergne, Orleans, Tours, Auxerre, in the sixth century, and of the Council in Trullo in the seventh century. The reformers of the sixteenth century in England, entrenching themselves, as usual, behind the letter of Scripture and the practice of the primitive Church, forbade marriages of consanguinity and affinity in the first, second, and third degrees according to the reckoning of the civil law, and in the first and second degrees according to the reckoning of the canon law, excepting those of first cousins, on which the early Christians pronounced no decisive judgment.

Ver. 19.—The marriage restrictions having been laid down, there follows in the five next verses the prohibition of five sexual impurities unconnected with marriage except by their subject-matter. The first is to approach unto a woman to uncover her nakedness, as long as she is put apart for her uncleanness, that is, either for seven days at the time of her ordinary illnesses (ch. xv. 19), or any longer time that her illness might last (ch. xv. 25), or for forty days after the birth of a man child (ch. xii. 2—4), or for eighty days after the birth of a girl (ch. xii. 5). The penalty for the offence within the

seven days is death if committed wilfully (ch. xx. 18); if fallen into unknowingly, a ceremonial penalty of seven days' uncleanness is incurred (ch. xv. 24). It is twice referred to by Ezekiel as a gross sin (Ezek. xvii. 6; xxii. 10).

Ver. 20.—The second prohibition is, *Thou shalt not lie carnally with thy neighbour's wife*—a prohibition already made in other words in the ten commandments. The punishment for adultery is death by stoning (ch. xx. 10; Deut. xxii. 22; John ix. 5)—a more severe penalty than was usually inflicted in other nations.

Ver. 21.—The third prohibition is, *Thou shalt not let any of thy seed pass through the fire to Molech*. The words *the fire* are properly inserted, though not expressed in the original (cf. Deut. xviii. 10; 2 Kings xxii. 10). What was the nature and purpose of the idolatrous rite in question is, however, uncertain. It is generally assumed that reference is made to the practice of offering children in sacrifice to Molech, Deut. xii. 31, Ezek. xvi. 20, and Ps. cxi. 37 being quoted in support of that view. But it is by no means certain that this was the case. It might have been a rite by which children were dedicated to Molech—a baptism by fire, not resulting in the death of the child. Its mention here, in close connection with carnal sins, has led some to regard it as an impure rite; but this is a mistaken inference, for the prohibition of adultery naturally suggests the prohibition of a spiritual unfaithfulness. That it was some kind of idolatrous ceremony is shown by the addition of the words, *neither shalt thou profane the name of thy God*. But if the children were burnt to death in honour of the idol, from the beginning, we should expect to find a notice of the fact in less ambiguous language than the expression, *pass through the fire*, conveys, earlier than the days of Ahaz. It is easy to imagine that what began as a dedication ceremony may have become converted into an absolute sacrifice, retaining still its original designation. Molech was a Canaanitish and Phoenician deity, the name meaning King, just as Baal means Lord (see Selden, 'De Diis Syria,' i. 6). Jarchi, quoted by Wordworth, describes the idol as "made of brass, having the face of an ox, with arms stretched out, in

which the child was placed and burnt with fire, while the priests were beating drums, in order to drown the noise of its shrieks, lest the fathers might be moved with pity thereby." The place where the children were offered, in the later period of the Jewish history, was the valley of Hinnom (Jer. vii. 31; xxii. 35; 2 Kings xxiii. 10).

Ver. 22.—The fourth prohibition forbids the sin of Sodom (see Gen. xix. 5; Judg. xi. 22; Rom. i. 27; 1 Cor. vi. 9; 1 Tim. i. 10). The penalty is death (ch. xx. 13).

Ver. 23.—The fifth prohibition (see Herod., ii. 16). The penalty is death (ch. xx. 15).

Vers. 24—30.—These verses contain a warning against the sins of incest and impurity already specified. The reason why the Canaanites were cast out before the Israelites was that they were defiled in all these things, . . . and the land was defiled by them. God visited the iniquity of these debased races, and the land itself vomited out her inhabitants on account of their abominations. The fate of the Canaanites was therefore a witness to them of what would be their fate if they did like them. Defile not ye yourselves in any of these things. . . . Ye shall not commit any of these abominations, . . . that the land spue not you out also, when ye defile it. Special penalties are appointed for particular sins further on. Here there are but two punishments denounced, one for individual sinners, the other national. The individual sinner is to be cut off from the nation by excommunication. For whosoever shall commit any of these abominations, even the souls that commit them shall be cut off from among their people. The nation, if it does not thus purify itself by cutting off from itself the authors of these corruptions, is to perish like the Canaanites. The words vomiteth (ver. 25) and spued out (ver. 28) are in that tense of the Hebrew verb which is generally called by grammarians a preterite, but this tense does not necessarily imply a past time; the time referred to depends on the context. The previous verbs, "I cast out," "I do visit," being present in sense, the two verbs, "vomiteth out (her inhabitants)," and "spued out (the nations that were before you)," are present also (see Introduction).

## HOMILETICS.

Vers. 1—18.—*The restraints thrown about marriage by God's Law* are not meant to confine within the narrowest limits that which is a necessary evil, but to guard a holy institution, and prevent its being corrupted by abuse. Manichæanism and asceticism, which is essentially Manichæan in its character, denounce the body and the bodily affections as being in themselves bad; stoicism strives to crush out or eradicate natural

feelings, to make place for a passionless calm. God's Law and the doctrine of the Church declare that it is the abuse, not the use, of the body that is wrong ; and, like the better forms of philosophy, occupy themselves with regulating, controlling, ruling man's passions, instead of vainly attempting to kill them. "Marriage is honourable in all, and the bed undefiled: but whoremongers and adulterers God will judge" (Heb. xiii. 4).<sup>1</sup>

**I. MARRIAGE WAS INSTITUTED AS THE PRIMEVAL LAW AT THE CREATION OF WOMAN.** "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth" (Gen. i. 27, 28). "And Adam said, This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man. Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh" (Gen. ii. 23, 24).

**II. PARALLEL BETWEEN THE MARRIAGE LAW AND THE SABBATICAL LAW.** 1. The sabbatical law, in like manner as the marriage law, was instituted at the creation (Gen. ii. 3). 2. Both laws took a special form for the patriarchal and Israelitish Churches. 3. In both cases an alteration was made by the authority of our Lord, the obligation of the laws still continuing as before. The form which the law of the sabbath took for the Jewish people may be seen in the seventh commandment and other Mosaic injunctions respecting the seventh day. The law of marriage likewise underwent a change from its original character, and instead of enjoining monogamy, it allowed polygamy; and "because of the hardness of men's hearts," it permitted divorce for light causes (see Matt. xix. 3-12). The manner of observing the sabbatical law was changed for Christians by the authority which our Lord declared himself to possess for the purpose (Matt. xii. 8), and which the constant habit of the earliest Christians, of assembling on the first day of the week and regarding it as the commemoration of the Resurrection day, proves him to have exercised. In like manner, he restored the law of monogamy (Matt. xix. 8), and withdrew the licence for divorce, except in the one case of adultery on the part of the wife (Matt. xix. 9). In respect to the Levitical restraints on marriage he made no change, as is again proved to us by the universal recognition of these obligations on the part of the early Christians.

**III. ADDITIONAL SANCTITY WAS ADDED TO MARRIAGE BY CHRISTIANITY.** In the Epistle to the Ephesians, St. Paul points out the analogy which exists between the relation of husbands to wives, and of wives to husbands, and the relation of Christ to the Church, and of the Church to Christ. "The husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the Church: and he is the saviour of the body. Therefore as the Church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in everything. Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the Church, and gave himself for it. . . . For no man ever yet hated his own flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the Church: for we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh. This is a great mystery: but I speak concerning Christ and the Church" (Eph. v. 23-32). An inference has been drawn from these words that Christ instituted holy matrimony as a sacrament of the Christian Church. Such inference is altogether false. Marriage was not considered one of seven sacraments until the days of the Schoolmen; but the passage exhibits the holiness of marriage in a new light, and gives a new reason for its being regarded as holy. The "mystery" is the analogy which exists between married persons and Christ and the Church. St. Paul quotes the words of institution from the Book of Genesis, showing what a high estate matrimony is, and gives this further reason for its holiness, which had not previously been known to exist. Such a thought as this takes marriage out of the sphere of carnal things, refining, purifying, and sanctifying it in a manner not yet appreciated wherever celibacy is regarded as a higher and holier condition.

**IV. THE CAUSES FOR WHICH MATRIMONY WAS ORDAINED.** "First, It was ordained for the procreation of children, to be brought up in the fear and nurture of the Lord, and to the praise of his holy Name. Secondly, It was ordained for a remedy against sin, and to avoid fornication. . . . Thirdly, It was ordained for the mutual society, help,

<sup>1</sup> "Let marriage be had in honour among all, and let the bed be undefiled: for fornicators and adulterers God will judge."—Revised Version.

and comfort, that the one ought to have of the other, both in prosperity and adversity" (Form of Solemnization of Matrimony). The third of these causes has been too often forgotten in the Christian Church, and the second has been too much dwelt upon; the consequence of which has been a low estimate of marriage, and therefore of woman. St. Paul's words ought to show us that it is this characteristic which gives its Christian aspect to marriage.

**V. DUTIES OF HUSBANDS AND WIVES TOWARDS EACH OTHER.** On the one side, love and protection (Eph. v. 25); on the other side, love and submission (Eph. v. 24, 33).

**Vers. 19-23.**—The preservation of the marriage relationship in its purity is the safeguard against sins of lust, which will be sure to invade a society wherever licentiousness or asceticism has dishonoured marriage.

**Vers. 24-30.**—Dissolute morals in respect to the relations of the sexes is always a symptom which precedes the ruin of an empire or the fall of a nation. It is both a sign and a cause—a sign of a general corruption, which will show itself elsewhere and under other forms; and a cause of the coming evils, as indulgence in bodily pleasures and Sybarite excesses takes away the firmness of will and readiness to endure hardness which are necessary conditions of both soldiers and citizens doing their duty to the State. When a country is sunk in dissoluteness there is, generally speaking, no renovation for it except by the irruption of a new race, as of the Israelites in Canaan, or of the barbarous nations on the breaking up of the old Roman Empire. The moral reason of the extermination of the Canaanites was the danger of their licentiousness spreading, as has often been the case, to the conquerors (cf. Numb. xxv. 17, 18).

#### HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

**Unworldliness.** Ch. xviii.; cf. Rom. xii. 2. The next element in the morality required of the Lord's people is non-conformity to this world. We are such imitative creatures that we are prone to do as our neighbours do, without questioning the propriety of their conduct. Whenever we adopt the ordinary standard of life, without inquiring how it is related to the Divine standard, we are conforming to the worldly spirit. The worldly conduct may be much higher in one age than in another, and in one country than in another; but *the essence of worldliness is unquestioning conformity to the standard of our neighbours.*

In the present chapter we have a fearful picture of the morality, or rather immorality, of Canaan. It may be read in connection with Rom. i. 18-32, as showing the depth to which unrestrained desire may descend. Not only do the Canaanites appear to have indulged in the most reckless licentiousness with nearest relatives, but also to have indulged in sodomy, and even to have descended to carnal intercourse with beasts. That is to say, they gave up their high vantage-ground as intellectual and moral beings, and descended to the level of brute beasts (cf. 2 Pet. ii. 12). We would require to go to the dark places of heathenism, which are still "full of the habitations of cruelty" (Ps. lxxiv. 20), to find an exact parallel at present for Canaan. The progress of civilization has smoothed the surface of society, however little it may have touched its heart. But what we must notice is that the principle of worldly conformity may be just as active in our boasted civilization, as in the darkest haunts of heathenism.

**I. THE HIGHEST CIVILIZATION IS NO SUFFICIENT REASON FOR A CERTAIN LINE OF CONDUCT.** The Israelites had been developed in Egypt, which was then at the head of civilization. It would be a very great temptation, therefore, to these liberated bondmen to walk according to the customs and ordinances of Egypt. They would be tempted to do many things on no higher ground than that they had seen them done in Egypt. No wonder, therefore, that the Lord admonishes them in these terms: "After the doings of the land of Egypt, wherein ye dwelt, shall ye not do" (ver. 3).

And yet is not this exactly the position taken up by many at this hour? They do many things "on the very highest authority." The reason of the course, its moral value, is never thought of, but simply the precedent which can be produced for it. This

spirit of "simian imitation" is worldliness pure and simple. The highest civilization is not necessarily moral, much less religious: why should I conform to the demands of a capricious code of laws, which may have no valid moral principle within them at all? God surely has not given us reflection and conscience to be ignored in such a way as this.

II. PREVAILING CUSTOM IS NO SUFFICIENT REASON EITHER FOR A CERTAIN LINE OF CONDUCT. The Israelites, in coming into Canaan, would find the inhabitants the freest and easiest possible in the matter of morals. No restraint appears to have been put upon their passions. They did whatever was right in their own eyes. Their lusts were their law. Now, were the Israelites to go into the land in the "jolly-good-fellow" style, they would be popular at once. The entrance into Canaan would in such a case have been an easy and triumphal march. Conformity to prevailing custom would have made the immigration a God-send to the beastly inhabitants. It would have given novelty to their desires. Hence God warns his people in the words, "And after the doings of the land of Canaan, whither I bring you, shall ye not do: neither shall ye walk in their ordinances" (ver. 3).

The snare of popularity prevails at present as powerfully as it did when Israel was about to enter Canaan. There is a great disposition with professedly religious people, "when at Rome, not to quarrel with the pope." Conformity to prevailing custom is a popular rôle to play. It costs nothing, except indeed the sacrifice of principle, and it gains in the worldly sense much. But no thinking mind imagines it is a rule of human conduct which will stand a moment's consideration. Why should I yield to what may be a senseless and even an immoral custom, simply because it is a custom? I have not been endowed with reason for such an irrational result as this.

III. WHEN MEN SACRIFICE THEIR MANHOOD TO WORLDLY CONFORMITY, THEY FIND EVENTUALLY THAT THEY HAVE TAKEN A SUICIDAL COURSE. The course of the Canaanites was a suicidal one. The land was spewing them out (ver. 28). The selfish, lustful lives they led, the brutalities they practised, became their scourge, and they were fading away. The same result is found among the heathen nations. The sacrifice of manhood to bestiality must pay the penalty of eventual extinction.

And though at first sight the operation of the principle may be retarded by the higher *morale* of civilization, there can be no doubt that the suicidal character of worldly conformity is a real experience. An individual loses mental as well as moral power, who conforms without question to the worldly customs of his time, and thus sacrifices his manhood. The easy-going, popular individual, who does this, that, and the other, for fear of being thought singular, is found to have very little strength of mind to begin with, and less every day he lives. In fact, nature is constructed upon the principle that the despised talent of manhood is forfeited when not employed, and there is a clear descent in the scale of being.

IV. GOD HAS GIVEN US SUFFICIENTLY PLAIN STATUTES AND LAWS TO REINFORCE US IN OUR COMBAT WITH THE WORLD. "Ye shall do my judgments, and keep mine ordinances, to walk therein: I am the Lord your God. Ye shall therefore keep my statutes, and my judgments; which if a man do, he shall live in them: I am the Lord" (vers. 4, 5). "And be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God" (Rom. xii. 2). Transformation, "transfiguration" (*μεταμορφώσε*; cf. Matt. xvii. 2; Mark ix. 2) as we might call it, that is, a bringing of ourselves into conformity to a Divine ideal; this is what unworldliness consists in. We do not cease to be worldly when we surrender half a dozen suspicious pleasures. We cease to be "worldly" only when we refuse to accept of the prevailing worldly standard as our law of life, and seek earnestly to know "what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God."

And to help us to this God has not only given us a book so plain and practical upon matters of daily life that he that runs may read; but he has also embodied his ideal in the perfect manhood of his Son. We have simply to ask the question, "What would Christ, were he in our circumstances, do?" and instantly we are enabled to decide on an appropriate and an unworldly course of action. It is this manly rule of life to which we are called. To bow down to the customs of even the best society or the highest civilization without inquiring how these customs stand towards the Divine

Law, is to sacrifice our birthright of manliness for a mess of the rudest pottage.—R. M. E.

Vers. 1—30.—*Abominable doings.* This chapter contains laws against abominations practised by the heathen, together with reasons why they must be avoided by the people of God. Foremost amongst these reasons is—

I. *THAT THEY ARE FORBIDDEN BY GOD.* This is the highest reason, for: 1. *He is the supreme Arbiter of men* (vers. 5, 6, 24): “I am the Lord.” (1) He is our Creator. His power over the work of his hands is absolute. It is our wisdom to confess this without gainsaying. (2) He is our Governor. He has not abandoned his creation to mechanical laws. The providence of his intelligence is everywhere and ever active. This his people saw in the miracles of the Exodus. (3) Moral beings are morally responsible to a God of holiness and truth. His will is law. It is truth. It is purity. 2. *He is the covenant Friend of his people* (vers. 1, 4, 30): “I am the Lord your God.” (1) The covenant relationship is set forth in this declaration. It therefore suggests all the promises. Blessings pertaining to this life; also to that which is to come. What glorious blessings! (2) Gratitude is appealed to here. Love should constrain us. The obedience of love is the purest. It is most acceptable to God. It is most perfect; for the whole being is in it.

II. *THAT THE HEATHEN HAVE PRACTISED THEM.* 1. *They were the doings of the Egyptians* (ver. 3). (1) The corrupt state of heart which prompted them, and which was aggravated by their repetition, was that from which the children of Israel suffered cruel and relentless persecutions and oppressions. The bitter experience they had of these abominations should lead them scrupulously to avoid them. (2) If they had learnt to follow their vices, it is time to unlearn them, now that they have been delivered from Egypt. Providence furnished men with opportunities favourable to repentance and reformation. We are answerable for these. 2. *They were the doings of the Canaanites.* (1) Customs common to the heathen should be viewed with suspicion by the people of God. The practices of custom come to be called “ordinances” (see ver. 3). Ordinances of man must not be confounded with ordinances of God. (2) We need admonition here. It is easy to flow with the stream; difficult to stem the torrent. We must brace ourselves to this. We should look to God to nerve our resolution.

III. *THAT THE MATTER IS VITAL.* 1. *God leads his people into temptation.* (1) Thus he led his people into Egypt. Now he conducts them in amongst the Canaanites. “Shall there be evil in a city and the Lord hath not done it?” (see Isa. xlv. 7; Amos iii. 6). (2) Yet is not God the Author of *moral* evil. Physical may exist apart from moral evil. Witness the afflictions of Job (see also John ix. 1—3). (3) God leads men into temptation, not that they may fall into it, but that they may learn to resist it, and so form a strong moral character. 2. *There is life in the Law to those who can keep it.* (1) In so far as it is fulfilled, it brings the benefits of a wise and good code (Deut. iv. 8; Neh. ix. 13, 14; Pa. cxlvii. 19, 20). (2) But who can so fulfil it as to ensure eternal life? Not one (see Luke x. 25—28; Rom. x. 5). (3) Therefore faith is declared to be the principle of justification (Hab. ii. 14). Upon this Paul founds his reasoning (Gal. iii. 10—14; Rom. i. 16, 17; Phil. iii. 9). 3. *Ruin is denounced upon the transgressor.* (1) Faith is the principle of a true obedience. The transgressor of the Law denies his faith and comes under the curse (Heb. x. 38; Deut. xxvii. 26; Jer. xi. 3). (2) For his sake the land is cursed (ver. 25). So defiled may it become as to be unfit for the tabernacle of God. The curse upon the ground for man’s sake came in the form of a deluge of water; it will yet come in a flood of fire (Gen. iii. 17; v. 29; 2 Pet. iii. 7). (3) The transgressor is cut off from among his people (ver. 29; comp. 1 Cor. iii. 17). The abomination in which he is held is vigorously set forth under the figure of the land vomiting and spewing out its inhabitants (vers. 25, 28). So were the Egyptians ejected. So were the ancient Canaanites (see Gen. xv. 16; Rev. iii. 16). So in turn were the Israelites (Ezek. xx. 11, 13, 21). We should not be highminded, but fear (Rom. xi. 19—21; Heb. iv. 11). “Lay the ear of your faith to the gates of the bottomless pit, and hear the doleful shrieks and outcries of damned sinners, whom earth hath spewed out, and hell has swallowed, and tremble lest this be your portion at the last” (M. Henry).—J. A. M.

Vers. 1—4.—*Two aspects of sin.* There are many ways in which sin may be regarded. Directed by these words, we may look at it in—

I. **ITS UGLY ASPECT AS SEEN IN HUMAN ILLUSTRATIONS.** The children of Israel were warned to separate themselves in every way from “the doings of the land of Egypt” and from “the doings of the land of Canaan” (ver. 3). These were to be a beacon to them; they were things to be hated and shunned. To those who had not been brought down themselves to the same low moral level, these doings would appear the shameful things they were—base, corrupt, vile. It is well for us to glance at, though not to dwell upon, sin in its last and worst developments, in its final issues; to see and understand what it leads to and ends in. Look at intemperance, dishonesty, cruelty, cupidity, profanity, impurity, as these sins are seen in their full development and complete out-working; see how utterly vile and hideous they appear to those in whom any purity is left. You would not resemble these; you start and shrink at the very thought of it; then do not move one inch down the smooth decline, do not take one step along “the primrose path of dalliance” with temptation. If we would keep well away from the beginnings of evil, we shall find a strong inducement to purity and honour by one thought of “the doings of the land” of impurity and shame.

II. **ITS EVIL ASPECT AS GATHERED FROM THE COMMANDMENTS OF GOD.** “I am the Lord your God . . . Ye shall not do . . . Ye shall do my judgments, and keep mine ordinances, to walk therein: I am the Lord your God.” These solemn and weighty words introduce the prohibition of various evil lusts; these unholy passions were not only to be loathed and shunned because of the shamefulness of them in themselves and because of the evil consequences they would entail, but also and chiefly because they were imperatively disallowed by God. “I am the Lord . . . ye shall not do these things,” etc. God’s decisive disapproval is enough for us; it is final; it should be all-prevailing. For: 1. *His sovereignty suffices*, without further thought. He is “the Lord our God.” Surely our Divine Creator, he from whom we came, in whom we live, without the continual exercise of whose power we should cease to be, to whom we owe all that we are and have, has sovereign right to decide concerning us, what things we may do and what things we shall shun. It is enough, it is more than enough, that the Lord our God says, concerning anything, “Ye shall not do it.” 2. Nevertheless, there is the further thought that *God knows best* what is good and evil. He who made us, who “knows what is in man,” who sees the end from the beginning, and knows what are the tendencies and issues of all things, can surely decide better than we can what are the desirable relations we should hold with our fellows; how near we may approach them; what may be our alliances and intimacies with them, etc.; which is the right and true path in which to walk. 3. And there is this additional thought that *his Divine interest in us is equal to his Divine knowledge of us.* We are sure that God will not deny us any really desirable thing; that he seeks our happiness and well-being; that if he limits our liberty or narrows our delights, it is purely because he is working out our true and lasting good.

Therefore, if we would not “condemn ourselves in those things which we allow” (Rom. xiv. 22), we must not only shrink from those evils which show themselves in the “doings of the land” of ungodly men, but also consult the commandment of the Lord. We must ask ourselves what those actions and relations are which he has forbidden. We must remind ourselves of his sovereignty over us, his knowledge of us, and his good pleasure toward us; we must also sedulously banish from our mind as well as put away from our life the evil thing to which we may be tempted.—C.

Ver. 5.—*Life in obedience.* The Apostle Paul, both in his letter to the Romans (x. 5), and in that to the Churches of Galatia (iii. 12), brings this passage to prove that salvation under the Law was by obedience rather than by faith. We may approach the main thought of the text by two preliminary remarks on the relation of these two principles of life, showing the consistency of the Law and the gospel. We maintain—

I. **THAT, UNDER THE LAW, MERE CONFORMITY OF CONDUCT WITHOUT FAITH WAS UNACCEPTABLE TO GOD.** It is a mistake to suppose that God’s requirements of his ancient people were satisfied with a purely mechanical obedience. They were not only to “walk in his ways,” but they were also to “fear the Lord their God, and to love him

and to serve him *with all their heart and with all their soul*" (Deut. x. 12; see also Deut. vi. 5; xi. 13; xxx. 16, 20). They were not only to act righteously toward their neighbour, but to love him (ch. xix. 18). They were to "afflict their souls" on the Day of Atonement and Reconciliation (ch. xvi. 29). There can be little doubt that it was the duty of the priests and Levites to instruct the Hebrew worshippers to present their sacrifice unto the Lord, believing and feeling that he was there to receive their offering and to accept their penitence and their faith.

**II. THAT, UNDER THE GOSPEL, A LIVING FAITH IS CONSTANTLY ASSOCIATED WITH ACTIVE OBEDIENCE.** We are not saved by works, but by faith in Jesus Christ (Rom. iii. 28; v. 1; Eph. ii. 8, etc.). Yet the faith which saves is a "faith which worketh by love" (Gal. v. 6; Jas. ii. 18, 20, 22, etc.).

But the primary truth which is taught in this passage is rather this—

**III. THAT SPIRITUAL OBEDIENCE IS THE SECRET AND THE SOURCE OF TRUE HUMAN LIFE.** 1. It is the secret of all real life. What is human life? In what does it actually consist? The life of the brute consists in the performance of its animal functions, in its outward, sensible existence. But the life of a man consists in something higher. We live when our souls live, when we live before God and unto him; if a man will do God's will and keep his statutes and his judgments, "*he shall live in them*;" he will find his true life in the doing and the keeping of these; "this is life eternal, to know thee," etc. (John xvii. 3). To know God, to know him as he is revealed to us in Christ Jesus, to worship him, to rejoice in him, to love and to please him, to be gratefully and cheerfully obedient to his will in all things,—this is human life; all else is immeasurably below it. There is nothing worth calling life apart from the holy and happy service of God; a spiritual not a servile obedience is the secret of life on earth. 2. It is also *the source of the higher human life which is beyond*. The Jew who kept God's statutes not only found a true life *in* his obedience, but he also gained a true life *through* his obedience. God bestowed on him his Divine favour, conferred on him all those outward blessings which were then regarded as the highest token of the favour of the Eternal; he lived in the smile and the benediction of Jehovah. Our hope is brighter and more far-reaching than his. He had some glimmering of the blessedness beyond, but it was faint and feeble. We know that if our faith in a Divine Redeemer is manifested in a lasting spiritual obedience, we "*shall live*" a life of which the Jew had little thought, and of which we ourselves can only form some struggling anticipation. We know that if "*we are faithful unto death*," we shall have "*a crown of life*." The obedience of faith, continued to the end, will introduce us to the life which is (1) one of celestial fulness; (2) free from present care, sorrow, sin; (3) everlasting.—C.

**Vers. 6-23.—Impurity—its extent and source.** There are times when and conditions under which it is both our right and our duty to speak on this subject. We may offend delicacy by speech, and must therefore be careful what we say. But we may neglect obligation and opportunity by silence, and must therefore use fitting occasion for speech. There is a time to warn the young against an evil which may slay them with a mortal wound. We may glance, and only glance, at—

**I. THE FEARFUL LENGTH TO WHICH IMPURITY MAY PASS.** God made man male and female that, related to one another thus, they might be happy in one another's fellowship; that husband, wife, and child might complete the harmony of human life. But for the confusing and disturbing element of sin, there would have been nothing but holy conjugal affection and happy human homes. How dark and sad a contrast to this does society present! How melancholy the thought that impurity should not only have tainted so many souls, but should have taken so many forms! that not only have the natural relations of the sexes been too unlimited, too unrestrained, but that sin of this description has taken unnatural, shocking, and abominable forms! that its dark and shameful manifestations are such as we hardly like to name, and do not dare to think of (vers. 22, 23)! Only a holy compulsion will induce us even to make passing reference to such things. So low, to such dark depths, into such a "far country" of vileness does the sin of impurity extend.

**II. THAT GUILTY INDULGENCE IS THE ONLY EXPLANATION OF THIS EVIL PROGRESS.** How can such things be? is the simple question of the pure heart. How by any possibility can human nature sink into such a gulf of depravity? How can we account

for it that the soul which once knew the innocence of childhood finds an awful pleasure in such shameful deeds? The answer is undoubtedly here. The very possibility of it is a part of the penalty of the sins which have been committed. Sins of impurity leave a stain upon the soul; the seducer has not only to suffer the rebuke of God, the reproaches of the one he has wronged and ruined, and the stings of his own conscience—some day to be awakened, but he has to “bear his iniquity” in a depraved taste, in a stained and injured nature, in a lowered and baser appetite. In this, as in other matters, perhaps more fearfully than in most, “he that sinneth against God wrongeth his own soul” (Prov. viii. 36). Let the man who gives way to impurity remember that he is travelling on a downward course that ends in saddest depravation of soul, and that will leave him open to those more vile temptations which would disgrace and even disgust him now.

III. THE TRUE TREATMENT OF THIS DESTROYING SIN. Trace the evil back from its worst developments to its mildest form; from its fullest crime to its source in the soul. Incest, adultery, fornication, seduction, indecency, indelicate conversation, *the impure thought*. This last is the source of all. It is that which must be assailed, which must be expelled.

In this matter of the relation of the sexes, there are three main truths. 1. God gives to most of us the joy of conjugal love, and this is to be sanctified by being accepted as his gift (Jas. i. 17). Where it is denied we must be well satisfied with other mercies so freely given. 2. Its lasting happiness is only assured to the pure of heart. With all others its excellency will soon fade and die. 3. Therefore let us, by all possible means, guard our purity: (1) by avoidance of temptation (evil company, wrong literature); (2) by energetic expulsion of unworthy thoughts; (3) by realization of the presence of the heart-searching Holy One; (4) by earnest prayer; let us “keep our heart beyond all keeping,” etc. (Prov. iv. 23).—C.

Vers. 24—30.—*The penalty of sin.* The disastrous consequences of iniquity are clearly and strongly expressed in these concluding words of the chapter. We have the truth brought out—

I. THAT BY SIN WE CORRUPT OURSELVES. “Defile not ye yourselves in any of these things” (ver. 24); “that ye defile not yourselves therein” (ver. 30). Our Lord tells us that “out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications,” etc., and that “these things defile a man” (Matt. vii. 19, 20). And Paul tells us that we “are the temple of God,” and that “if any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy” (1 Cor. iii. 16, 17). Those sins which a man commits against his own spirit or his own body—those wrongs which a man does himself—end in positive and serious injury. They enfeeble, they degrade, they brutalize, they bring down a man’s tastes and appetites to the meanest levels, they lay and leave his nature open to the worst temptations. In the practice of vice a man sinks down daily until he becomes thoroughly corrupt, averse to all that is holy, prone to everything impure.

II. THAT BY SIN WE CONTAMINATE SOCIETY. “In all these the nations are defiled” (ver. 24); “and the land is defiled” (vers. 25, 27). Societies as well as individuals become corrupt. Even one Achan defiled the whole camp of Israel and paralyzed its power. One incestuous member of the Corinthian Church infected and stained that Christian society. How much more will many evil-doers corrupt the community! It may not take a large number of unholly, impure, unrighteous souls to make a Church or society “defiled” in the sight of the Holy One, no longer a fit dwelling-place for his Holy Spirit, a community to be abandoned to itself.

III. THAT BY SIN WE INCUR THE HIGH DISPLEASURE OF ALMIGHTY GOD. “Ye shall not commit any of *these abominations*” (vers. 26, 27, 29), “of *these abominable customs*” (ver. 30). The Holy One, in his righteous indignation, threatens that “the land shall spue them out” if they indulge in such iniquities. No stronger language could be employed to indicate the uttermost conceivable detestation and abhorrence which God has of such sins as these described. “It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God” (Heb. x. 31); and it is a fearful thing to have done or to have become that which God regards with Divine abomination, to be the object of his awful resentment and indignation; to have to feel that he, the Divine Father and the righteous Judge, cannot look on us without terrible aversion.

**IV. THAT BY SIN WE ARE DETERMINING OUR DOOM.** (Ver. 29.) Whether by being "cut off from among the people" we understand excommunication and exile or death, the penalty is severe. It is certain that ver. 28 points to stern rejection and utter destruction. 1. It is certain that by open sin we expose ourselves to exile from the Christian Church, and even to banishment from all decent and honourable society. The Church, the family, and the social circle must exclude the wanton offender for the sake of their pure and innocent members. 2. Also that by continuance in deliberate sin, whether open or secret, whether of the body or of the soul, we shall be rejected from the city of God. "There shall in no wise enter into it any thing that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination" (Rev. xxi. 27).—C.

Vers. 1-30.—Ver. 5, "Ye shall therefore keep my statutes, and my judgments: which if a man do, he shall live in them: I am the Lord."

**I. THE TRUE MORALITY IS BASED UPON THE TRUE RELIGION.** 1. Special need of insisting on this in times when men seek to make light of religious obligation. 2. Historical confirmation: Egypt, Persia, Greece, Rome,—all corrupt because degenerate. No protection, as luxury increases, from relaxation of manners save in religious safeguards. 3. The life of faith is life *in* commandments. The Lord is both the Object of faith and the Ruler of life. The commandments do not give faith or dispense with it, but reveal, test, and approve it.

**II. THE WORLD WITHOUT GOD IS A WORLD OF ABOMINATIONS AND DEATH.** All God's laws contribute to health and happiness. His judgments on the nations were the clearing away of moral filth and disorder. The state of the heathen is an indisputable evidence of man's natural depravity and ruin. Intellect, physical prowess, wealth, learning,—all were rendered useless, and worse than useless, by moral weakness.

**III. JUDGMENT AND MERCY WENT HAND IN HAND IN THE DIVINE DISPENSATION.** The offender was excommunicated that he might have opportunity for repentance—which made a warning to all. The land was to be kept from defilement that it might be the land of God's people. The sanctity of the bodily life, of personal purity, of domestic relationship, of the family, and so of the nation, are all made to depend on the sanctity of the first and deepest of all relations—that between man and God. "I am the Lord." The land is mine first, then yours. The Law is your safety and peace.—R.

Vers. 1-5.—*Obedience enjoined.* A nation's importance is not to be reckoned according to its size, but more according to the character of its people and of the great men who have belonged to it. That must ever be a distinguished nation which has had a Moses ruling over it, a man with whom God spoke face to face, instructing him by what rules to govern the people. Those rules form a code second to none in history for purity, justice, and completeness. At the head of a number of separate precepts stands the special injunction of the text, calling upon the Israelites to respect the entire Law.

**I. A REMINDER THAT IN EVERY PLACE THERE ARE EVIL PRACTICES TO BE SHUNNED.** The present position of every individual is an isthmus connecting the continent of the past and the future. Israel in the wilderness journeying from Egypt to Canaan was but like many between youth and manhood, school and business, activity and retirement. Such a transition state may be profitably used as a time of thought and resolution. In no position must we expect freedom from temptation. The conduct of the Egyptians and of the Canaanites must alike be avoided (ver. 3). And those who defer religious decision until a season of immunity from danger arrives, may tarry in vain. The wilderness has its lawless manners as well as the settled country. How necessary to be upon our guard lest we be corrupted by the customs of our neighbours! Happy the college, the mart, the home, that is less likely to contaminate than to purify!

**II. COMPLIANCE WITH THE LAWS OF GOD IS THE BEST PRESERVATIVE AGAINST IMITATING SINFUL CUSTOMS.** He runs quickest away from evil who pursues the good in front of him. Simply to retreat from danger, backing from it, is a slow and insecure method. We want more than negative righteousness, we need positive fulfilment of holy commands to ensure us against adopting odious habits. *It is not safe to take men as our patterns of behaviour.* "Be ye imitators of God as beloved children."

Egyptians and Canaanites were equally unfit to be followed. The Apostle Paul did not set up his own life as a model except in so far as he also imitated Christ (1 Cor. xi. 1). *Obedience is here described in three ways, as doing the judgments of God, keeping his ordinances, and walking therein (ver. 4).* Great is the privilege that moderns enjoy in having so many copies of God's Word multiplied as to be easily accessible to all. Surely we ought to meditate therein day and night, that we may order our steps thereby.

III. OBEDIENCE MAY BE STIMULATED BY REFLECTION. 1. *Upon the right of God to issue commands.* "I am Jehovah" is his claim to attention as the Fount of law, and a claim which no thoughtful mind should reject. The ever-living Almighty Holy One possesses in himself every attribute that demands our homage. To withhold it is to violate congruity, to act in a manner out of harmony with what fitness requires. 2. *Upon our acceptance of his lordship over us.* "I am the Lord your God." We have entered into covenant relationship with him, and we break the terms of agreement if we fail to keep his statutes. The plural form of "God" may, without forcing, be taken here to indicate that the Israelites had deliberately bound themselves to the one Jehovah as their "Gods," instead of the idols of the nations round. God is our Father, how shall we be disobedient children? our King, how can we act as rebellious subjects? our Lawgiver, how can we dare to transgress his commandments? 3. *Upon the blessedness attained by observance of God's statutes.* "Which if a man do, he shall live in them." Man thought to increase his power by tasting forbidden fruit, but he lost his life, and only regained it in proportion as he returned to obedience. It is true that the impossibility of perfectly keeping the Law foreshadowed the necessity of another way of salvation, but according as the Israelites adhered to the Law in letter and spirit, so they experienced happiness and the favour of God, which is life indeed. We rejoice in the gospel plan of faith in Christ, not as making the Law inoperative, but as enabling us to fulfil its aim, to accomplish its real design—sanctification of life; and therein delivered from thralldom, we enter upon the life eternal that comprehends all blessing. We listen to the Law now, not as if it were the stern prescription of a hard Taskmaster, but as the instruction of a loving, all-wise Friend, which the more closely we follow, the more prosperous our career will be. "Freely we serve, because we freely love."—S. R. A.

Vers. 24, 25.—*Abominations denounced.* Some chapters of law, as of history, are not pleasant reading. That they should have been found necessary is a proof of the fearful depravity into which man may fall, sinning against natural instincts, hurried away and blinded by passion so as to overstep the bounds of decency. The prohibitions of this chapter were designed to hallow marriage and the family relationship. Their observance would tend to benefit the entire nation, for the laws of God are framed with benevolent wisdom. To sin against them is to wrong one's own soul.

I. THE DENUNCIATIONS AND THREATENINGS EVINCE GOD'S HATRED OF ABOMINABLE CONDUCT. "That the land spue not you out also." "The souls that commit them shall be cut off from among their people." Strong is the language applied to sinful practices—they are "wickedness" (ver. 17), "abomination" (ver. 22), "confusion" (ver. 23). The Law will have no compromise, admits of no alternative amongst God's people, the command is, "Thou shalt not." Wickedness is not to be tolerated even in the stranger (ver. 26); he is not obliged to conform to all the ceremonies, but he must rigidly abstain from every moral offence. The New Testament relaxes not one jot in condemnation of all that is impure and filthy in conduct and even language (see Rom. i. 18, 32; 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10; Eph. v. 3—5; Rev. xxi. 8).

II. THE DELAY BETWEEN SIN AND PUNISHMENT IS A MARK OF THE KINDNESS AND LONG-SUFFERING OF GOD. (See Peter's argument in 2 Epist. iii. 9.) In Gen. xv. 16 it was expressly declared, "the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full." They were allowed four hundred years to repent, or to fill up the cup of their iniquity, and they chose the latter. This is the clearest answer to any who would impugn the justice of God's dealing with the Canaanites in exterminating them with fire and sword. Oh, the folly of men who abuse precious time by laughing at solemn announcements of coming woe, instead of employing it in making their peace with God! By every moment that intervenes between the sinner and death God urges him to seek pardon and amendment.

III. THE INSTANCES RECORDED SHOW THE CERTAIN VISITATION OF SIN WITH GOD'S displeasure. Delay is no guarantee of final immunity from punishment. The heathen were at last driven out of the land, and likewise the Israelites who succeeded felt the wrath of God on account of the shameful customs in which they indulged. *God is impartial*, and does not spare sin in his people or his enemies. As the denunciation shows God in principle and language, so the fulfilment of his threat demonstrates him in act, and is a further vivid evidence of his dislike of all wickedness. Nathan was God's messenger to rebuke and threaten David, as afterwards John the Baptist denounced Herod for taking his brother's wife. Just retribution foretells a day of judgment, when inequalities of punishment shall be righted and God's equity triumphantly vindicated. Here we see sufficient to establish the fact of the existence of a moral government (Eccles. viii. 11-13).

IV. THE CLIMAX OF SIN IS REACHED WHEN NATURE HERSELF SEEMS TO ABHOR THE SINNER. Graphic is the picture of the land loathing its burden and vomiting forth its inhabitants. As a leprosy infected walls and garments, so the abominations of the heathen defiled the land itself that it stank. The results of immorality upon the state of society and of individuals have been appalling. Eventually everything has sunk into ruin, disintegration and corruption have prevailed. The population decreased by sickness and barrenness and murder. The arts and sciences decay, literature is blighted, philanthropy unknown. The text reminds us that a closer connection exists between man and inanimate nature than we sometimes think (see this also suggested in Rom. viii. 20 and Gen. iii. 17).

CONCLUSION. If the subject is painful, the lesson may be salutary. Sin is widespread. "Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall." We may be glad of the healthful influence of Christianity, rightly directing public opinion, and erecting it into a safeguard against evil. "Having these promises, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God."—S. R. A.

## EXPOSITION.

### CHAPTER XIX.

From the prohibition of moral uncleanness exhibiting itself in the form of incest and licentiousness, the legislator proceeds to a series of laws and commandments against other kinds of immorality, inculcating piety, righteousness, and kindness. Chapter xix. may be regarded as an extension of the previous chapter in this direction, after which the subject of ch. xviii. is again taken up in ch. xx. The precepts now given are not arranged systematically, though, as Keil has remarked, "while grouped together rather according to a loose association of ideas than according to any logical arrangement, they are all linked together by the common purpose expressed in the words, 'Ye shall be holy: for I the Lord your God am holy.'" They begin by inculcating (in vers. 3, 4) duties which fall under the heads of (1) the fifth commandment of the Decalogue, (2) the fourth, (3) the first,

(4) the second. These four laws are, in their positive aspects, (1) the religious law of social order, on which a commonwealth rests; (2) the law of positive obedience to God's command because it is his command; (3) the law of piety towards the invisible Lord; (4) the law of faith, which trusts him without requiring visible emblems or pictures of him. In vers. 11, 14, 16, 35, 36, obedience is inculcated to the eighth and the ninth commandments, which are the laws of honesty and of truthfulness; in ver. 12 to the third commandment, which is the law of reverence; in vers. 17, 18, 33, 34, to the sixth commandment, which is the law of love; in ver. 20, 29, to the seventh commandment, which is the law of purity; in vers. 9, 10, 13, the spirit of covetousness is prohibited, as forbidden in the tenth commandment, which is the law of charity. Thus this chapter may in a way be regarded as the Old Testament counterpart of the Sermon on the Mount, inasmuch as it lays down the laws of conduct, as the latter lays down the principles of action, in as com-

prehensive though not in so systematic a manner as the ten commandments.

Ver. 2.—*Ye shall be holy: for I the Lord your God am holy.* The religious motive is put forward here, as in the previous chapter, as the foundation of all morality. It is God's will that we should be holy, and by being holy we are like God, who is to be our model so far as is possible to the creature. So in the new dispensation, "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect" (Matt. v. 48). "As he which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation" (1 Pet. i. 15).

Ver. 3.—*Ye shall fear every man his mother, and his father.* The words *fear* and *reverence* are in this connection interchangeable. So Eph. v. 33, "Let the wife see that she reverence her husband," where the word "reverence" would be more exactly translated by "fear." St. Paul points out that the importance of the fifth commandment is indicated in the Decalogue by its being "the first commandment with promise," that is, with a promise attached to it (Eph. vi. 2). The family life is built upon reverence to parents, and on the family is built society. Obedience to parents is a duty flowing out of one of the first two laws instituted by God—the law of marriage (Gen. ii. 24). The second law instituted at the same time was that of the sabbath (Gen. ii. 3), and in the verse before us observance of the sabbatical law is likewise inculcated, in the words that immediately follow—*ye shall keep my sabbaths.*

Ver. 4.—*Turn ye not unto idols.* The word used for *idols*, *elilim*, meaning nothings, is contrasted with *Elohim*, God. Ps. cxv. exhibits this contrast in several of its particulars. Cf. St. Paul's statement, "We know that an idol is nothing in the world, and that there is none other God but one" (1 Cor. viii. 4). "If the heart of man becomes benumbed to the use of images of false gods of any kind, he sinks down to the idols which are his ideals, and becomes as dumb and uninspirited as they are" (Lange). The remainder of the verse forbids the transgression of the second commandment, as the earlier part of the verse forbids the transgression of the first commandment: *nor make to yourselves molten gods*, as was done by Jeroboam when he set up the calves (1 Kings xii. 23).

Ver. 5—8.—The unsystematic character of this chapter is indicated by prohibitions under the fifth, fourth, first, and second commandments (vers. 3, 4) being succeeded by a ceremonial instruction respecting the peace offerings, repeated from ch. vii. 16—18. The words, *ye shall offer it at your own will*, should rather be, *for your acceptance*, as in ch. i. 3. In the seventh chapter a

distinction is drawn between the peace offerings that are thank offerings, which must be eaten on the first day, and the peace offerings which are vow or voluntary offerings, which may be eaten on the first or second day. In the present *résumé* this distinction is not noticed. Whoever transgresses this ceremonial command is to bear his iniquity and to be cut off from among his people, that is, to be excommunicated without any appointed form of reconciliation by means of sacrifice.

Vers. 9, 10.—The injunction contained in these verses, to not wholly reap the corners of thy field, neither . . . gather the gleanings of thy harvest, is twice afterwards repeated (ch. xxiii. 22; Deut. xxiv. 19—22). In Deuteronomy, the oliveyard is specified together with the harvest-field and the vineyard, and it is added that, if a sheaf be by chance left behind, it is to remain for the benefit of the poor. The object of this law is to inculcate a general spirit of mercy, which is willing to give up its own exact rights in kindness to others suffering from want. The word here used for vineyard covers also the oliveyard. The expression, *neither shalt thou gather every grape of thy vineyard*, would be more literally rendered, *neither shalt thou gather the scattering of thy vineyard*, meaning the berries (grapes or olives) which had fallen or which were left singly on the boughs.

Ver. 11.—Stealing, cheating, and lying are classed together as kindred sins (see ch. vi. 2, where an example is given of theft performed by means of lying; cf. Eph. iv. 25; Col. iii. 9).

Ver. 12.—*And ye shall not swear by my name falsely.* These words contain a positive permission to swear, or take a solemn oath, by the Name of God, and a prohibition to swear falsely by it (see Matt. v. 33).

Ver. 13.—Cheating and stealing are again forbidden, and, together with these, other forms of oppression although legal. The command to pay labourers their hire promptly—which covers also the case of paying tradesmen promptly—is repeated in Deut. xxiv. 14 (cf. Jas. v. 4).

Ver. 14.—*Thou shalt not curse the deaf.* The sin of cursing another is in itself complete, whether the curse be heard by that other or not, because it is the outcome of sin in the speaker's heart. The suffering caused to one who hears the curse creates a further sin by adding an injury to the person addressed. Strangely in contrast with this is not only the practice of irreligious men, who care little how they curse a man in his absence, but the teaching which is regarded by a large body of Christians as incontrovertible. "No harm is done to reverence but by an open manifes-

tation of insult. How, then, can a son sin gravely when he curses his father without the latter's knowing it, or mocks at him behind his back, inasmuch as in that case there is neither insult nor irreverence? And I think that the same is to be said, even though he does this before others. It must be altogether understood that he does not sin gravely if he curses his parents, whether they are alive or dead, unless the curses are uttered with malevolent meaning." This is the decision of one that is called not only a saint, but "doctor of the Church" (Liguori, 'Theol. Moral.', iv. 334). "Whoso curseth his father or his mother, his lamp shall be put out in obscure darkness," says the Word of God (Prov. xx. 20). *Nor put a stumblingblock before the blind, but shalt fear thy God.* By the last clause the eye is directed to God, who can see and punish, however little the blind man is able to help himself. (Cf. Job xxix. 15, "I was eyes to the blind, and feet was I to the lame.")

Ver. 15.—Justice is to be done to all. The less danger of respecting the person of the poor has to be guarded against, as well as the greater and more obvious peril of honouring the person of the mighty. The scales of Justice must be held even and her eyes bandaged, that she may not prefer one appellant to another on any ground except that of merit and demerit. "If ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors" (Jas. ii. 9).

Ver. 16.—*Thou shalt not go up and down as a talebearer among thy people.* For the evil done by mere idle talebearing, see Bishop Butler's sermon, 'Upon the Government of the Tongue,' and four sermons by Bishop Jeremy Taylor, on 'The Good and Evil Tongue; Slander and Flattery; the Duties of the Tongue.' *Neither shalt thou stand against the blood of thy neighbour;* that is, thou shalt not endanger his life, which is the result of the worst kind of talebearing, namely, bearing false witness against him. Thus the effect of the false witness of the two men of Belial against Naboth was that "they carried him forth out of the city, and stoned him with stones, that he died" (1 Kings xxi. 13; cf. Matt. xxvi. 60; xxvii. 4).

Ver. 17.—On the one side we are not to hate our brother in our heart, whatever wrongs he may commit; but on the other side, we are in any wise to rebuke our neighbour for his wrong doing. So our Lord teaches, "If thy brother trespass against thee, rebuke him" (Luke xvii. 3); and he appoints a solemn mode of procedure, by which this fraternal rebuke is to be conveyed in his Church: "If thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone; if he shall hear thee, thou hast

gained thy brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the Church; but if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican" (Matt. xviii. 15—17). Therefore St. Paul warns his delegates, Timothy and Titus, "Them that sin rebuke before all" (1 Tim. v. 20). "Reprove, rebuke" (2 Tim. iv. 2). "Rebuke them sharply" (Titus i. 13). "Rebuke with all authority" (Titus ii. 15). By withholding reproof in a bitter spirit, or from a feeling of cowardice, we may become partakers of other men's sins. Whoever fails to rebuke his neighbour when he ought to do so, *bears sin on his account* (the more correct and less ambiguous rendering of the words translated in the Authorized Version, *suffer sin upon him*, cf. Numb. xviii. 22, 32). God's people are their brothers' keepers (Gen. iv. 9).

Ver. 18.—Revenge and malice are forbidden as well as hatred, and the negative precepts culminate in the positive law, *Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself*, which sums up in itself one half of the Decalogue (Matt. xxii. 40). "For he that loveth another hath fulfilled the Law. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his neighbour: therefore love is the fulfilling of the Law" (Rom. xiii. 8—10).

Ver. 19.—*Ye shall keep my statutes.* Having arrived at the general conclusion, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself," in the previous verse, the legislator pauses, and then presents a collection of further laws, arranged as before in no special order. The first is a mystical injunction against the confusion of things which are best kept apart, illustrated in three subjects—diverse kinds of cattle in breeding, mingled seeds in sowing a field, and mixed materials in garments. In Deut. xxii. 10, a further illustration is added, "Thou shalt not plow with an ox and an ass together." The existence of mules, which we find frequently mentioned in the later history (2 Sam. xiii. 29; xviii. 9; 1 Kings i. 33), may be accounted for by supposing that the positive precept with regard to breeding cattle here laid down was transgressed, or that the mules were imported from abroad (see 1 Kings x. 25). The word used here and in Deut. xxii. 11 for a garment mingled of linen and woollen, is *shaatnez*, an Egyptian word, meaning probably mixed. The difficulty raised on this

verse by the allegation that the high priest's dress was made of mixed materials, is met by the answer that, if it were of mixed materials (which is uncertain, for wool is not mentioned in Exod. xxviii., nor is it quite determined that *shesh* means linen), the mixture was not such as is here forbidden. The moral meaning of the whole of this injunction is exhibited in the following passages from the New Testament, "Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils" (1 Cor. x. 21). "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? and what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? and what agreement hath the temple of God with idols?" (2 Cor. vi. 14—16). "He cannot love the Lord Jesus with his heart," says Hooker, "who lendeth one ear to his apostles and another to false teachers, and who can brook to see a mingle-mangle of religion and superstition" ('Serm.' v. 7, quoted by Wordsworth).

Vers. 20—22.—A distinction is drawn between adultery with a free woman, or a betrothed free virgin, which was punishable with death (ch. xx. 20; Deut. xxii. 23), and with a slave betrothed to another man (probably a slave also). In the latter case a lesser punishment, no doubt that of scourging (according to the Mishna to the extent of forty stripes), was to be inflicted on one or both, according to the circumstances of the case. The words, *she shall be scourged*, should be translated, *there shall be investigation*, followed, presumably, by the punishment of scourging, for both parties if both were guilty, for one if the woman was unwilling. The man is afterwards to offer a trespass offering. As the offence has been a wrong as well as a sin, his offering is to be a trespass offering (see on ch. v. 14). In this case the fine of one-fifth could not be inflicted, as the wrong done could not be estimated by money, and the cost of the ram seems to be regarded as the required satisfaction. No mention is made of damages to be paid to the man to whom the slave-girl was betrothed, probably because he was himself a slave, and had not juridical rights against a freeman.

Vera. 23—25.—The eating of the fruit of young trees by their owners for five years is forbidden, on the principle that such fruit is unclean until it has been sanctified by the offering of a crop as firstfruits to the Lord for the use of the servants of the tabernacle, and a full crop is not to be expected until the fourth year from the time that the trees were planted. The fruit is at first to be counted as uncircumcised, being regarded in

a position similar to that of the heathen, that is, unclean, from not having been yet sanctified by the offering of the firstfruits. This sanctification takes place in the fourth year.

Vers. 26—28.—After a repetition of the fundamental ceremonial law against eating things which have the blood in them (the LXX. rendering, *ἐπὶ τῶν ὄπτον*, "upon the mountains," arises from a mistaken reading), follow prohibitions (1) to use enchantment, literally, *to whisper or mutter after holding communication with serpents* (if the word *nicheah* be derived from *nachash*, a serpent); (2) to observe times, or rather, according to a more probable etymology, *exercies the evil eye*; (3) to round the corners of your heads, that is, use a sort of tonsure, as was done by some Arabian tribes (Herod., iii. 8) in honour of their god Orotal, and by the Israelites as a form of mourning (Deut. xiv. 1; Isa. xxii. 12); (4) to mar the corners of thy beard, a fashion of mourning which accompanied the tonsure of the head (see ch. xxi. 5; Isa. xv. 2; Jer. xlvi. 37); (5) to make any cuttings in your flesh for the dead, another form of mourning, associated with the two previously mentioned practices (see ch. xxi. 5; Deut. xiv. 1; Jer. xvi. 6; xli. 3; xlvi. 37); (6) to print any marks upon you, that is, tattoo themselves in memory of the dead. All these customs were unbecoming the dignity of God's people, and had been connected with idolatrous practices.

Vera. 29.—*Do not prostitute thy daughter.* This is a peremptory prohibition, applying to every Jewish maiden, introduced in this place with a primary relation to the sanctification of lust by the dedication of young girls at some heathen temples; but by no means confined in its application to such practices. All legal sanction of the sin of prostitution is forbidden, for whatever purpose it may be given; and the certain result of such sanction is indicated in the final words of the verse, *lest the land fall to whoredom, and the land become full of wickedness* (cf. Deut. xxxiii. 17).

Vera. 30.—The command in this verse differs from that in ver. 3 by adding the injunction to reverence my *sanctuary* to that requiring the observance of the sabbath. It is a matter of experience that where the sabbath is not kept, God's *sanctuary* is not reverenced, and that that reverence increased or falls away according as the obligation of the sabbatical law, whether in its Jewish form or its Christian form, be more or less recognized. The sabbatical ordinance is necessary as a previous condition of religious worship. Without it, the business and pleasure of the world are too strong to give way to the demands upon time made by the stated service of

God. The verse is repeated in ch. xxvi. 2. "When the Lord's day is kept holy, and a holy reverence for the Lord's sanctuary lives in the heart, not only are many sins avoided, but social and domestic life is pervaded by the fear of God, and characterized by devoutness and propriety" (Keil).

Ver. 31.—This verse contains a prohibition of all dealings with those that have familiar spirits or are wizards. The punishment of such persons is appointed in the next chapter. Both in the Old and the New Testament, the real existence of evil spirits and their power of communicating with the human spirit is assumed.

Ver. 32.—Reverence for the old is inculcated as being a part, not merely of natural respect, but of the fear of God. In the East this virtue, implying deference on the part of the strong to the weak, and of the inexperienced to the wise, exists in larger influence for good than in the West, where, however, its place has been, but only partially, supplied by the greater deference paid by man to woman (cf. Prov. xvi. 81; xx. 29).

Ver. 33, 34.—The command already given "neither to vex a stranger, nor oppress him" (Exod. xxii. 21), on the pathetic ground that "ye know the heart of a stranger, seeing ye were strangers in the land of Egypt" (Exod. xxiii. 9), is broadened in these verses to the positive law, thou shalt

love him as thyself. "The royal law of ver. 18 is expressly extended to the stranger, and notwithstanding the national narrowness necessary to preserve the true religion in the world, the general brotherhood of mankind is hereby taught as far as was possible under the circumstances" (Gardiner).

Ver. 35, 36.—These verses, beginning with the same words as ver. 15, *Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment*, contain another and wider application of that principle. Ver. 15 prohibited unrighteousness in the judge, or in one who was in the position of a judge; these verses forbid it in merchants and tradesmen. It is the more necessary to condemn dishonesty, in unmistakable terms, as men who make a profession of religion, and therefore would be shocked at stealing, have often less scruple in cheating. Here and in Deuteronomy, where the Law is repeated, a religious sanction is given to the command; "For all that do such things, and all that do unrighteously, are an abomination unto the Lord thy God" (Deut. xxv. 16). Cf. Prov. xi. 1, "A false balance is abomination to the Lord: but a just weight is his delight;" and xx. 10, "Divers weights, and divers measures, both of them are alike abomination to the Lord;" see also Micah vi. 10, 11 and Ezek. xlv. 10.

Ver. 37.—Moral precepts are rested on their right foundation—the command of God and the religious motive.

### HOMILETICS.

Ver. 1.—*Morality has a basis of its own.* The moral philosopher, if asked, "Why should I act morally?" replies, "Because it is right for you to do so." If asked further, "Why is it right for me to do so?" he replies, "Because your conscience tells you that it is." If asked why conscience should be obeyed rather than passion, he replies, "Because it possesses greater authority, even if it has less power;" and in proof of this he points to the approval or disapproval which it stamps upon acts according to their character. Morality can be proved to be reasonable, apart from religion.

But it cannot be enforced. If a man denies that his conscience commands him to perform a moral action, the verdict of the general conscience of mankind may be quoted against him as contrary to that of his own, but he can repudiate the authority of that verdict so far as he is himself concerned. He can reasonably maintain that the general conscience may be misled by prejudice or superstition, and that his own conscience is more enlightened than that of the mass. In this manner the philosopher, or any one who regards himself as a philosopher, finds a way of evasion ready at hand.

With the masses, moral teaching, unaccompanied by religious sanction, is still less effectual. The general good of mankind, or the duty of obeying the highest principle of our nature, has never restrained, and never will restrain, the mass of mankind from yielding to the force of strong passion or desire.

In the present chapter we find the moral duties—those of the second table as much as the first—rested upon a religious basis. They are God's commands, whether that command be given by written precept or by an instinct engraven on man's heart. And because they are God's commands in both these ways, they are to be obeyed. Thus there is an appeal from man's mind to something higher than himself, to which man

will submit. The effort to preserve morality in a nation without religious sanction and religious motive is like the attempt to keep alive the flame of a fire, when the fuel from which the flame is derived has been withdrawn. One generation may continue moral; the next will certainly be licentious. "I am the Lord" is a basis of morality which never fails.

Ver. 3.—*The laws of submission (1) to human authority and (2) to sacred ordinances, for the Lord's sake*, are enjoined in this verse.

1. The family is an institution of God's appointment (Gen. i. 28; ii. 24). The command to children to honour their father and mother is distinguished in the Decalogue by a blessing attached to it (Exod. xx. 12; Eph. vi. 2); and a special blessing is bestowed on the house of the Rechabites for obeying it (Jer. xxxv. 18). St. Paul enjoins the observance of the duty, both as an act right in itself and as positively commanded in God's Law (Eph. vi. 1, 2). The father's duty is "nurture and admonition of the Lord" (Eph. vi. 4), including guidance, remonstrance, reproof (1 Sam. ii. 23). By means of this institution the character of every member of the commonwealth is formed, at the moment when alone it is plastic, by the influence best adapted for turning it to good. Contrast the system adopted by Rousseau for dealing with his children, and the probable results on parents, children, and the State. Cf. the Form of Solemnization of Matrimony: "Marriage was ordained for the procreation of children, to be brought up in the fear and nurture of the Lord, and to the praise of his holy Name."

An analogous position to that of the parent is afterwards held by the civil magistrate in respect to the subject, and by the pastor in respect to a member of his flock. Therefore, in order to carry out the commandment, a man has not only "to love, honour, and succour his father and mother," but also "to honour and obey the queen, and all that are put in authority under her: to submit himself to all his governors, teachers, spiritual pastors and masters: to order himself lowly and reverently to all his betters" (Church Catechism). On the other hand, the authorities in the State and in the Church have their duties also, not now the same as those of the parent towards the child, on account of the changed position of him who was once a child, but nevertheless analogous to them. So in other cases, wherever men stand in a relation to each other similar to that of parent and child, obligations similar to those which bind parents and children arise.

2. Sabbatical observance appears, at first sight, a small thing to place on a level, as here, with the fifth commandment, or, as in the Decalogue, with the first, second, and third commandments; but when we examine into it closely, we find that this disproportion does not exist.

I. **ITS INSTITUTION.** It shares with the ordinance of marriage alone the characteristic of having been instituted at the creation of the world. "And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made" (Gen. ii. 3). Being coeval with creation, the sabbatical law, like the marriage law, is of universal obligation on all mankind.

II. **ITS JEWISH FORM.** The sabbatical law was observed during the period preceding the Mosaic Law (Exod. xvi. 22—30). For the Jews it took the form given it in the fourth commandment (Exod. xx. 8—11; Deut. v. 12—15) and other Mosaic injunctions (Exod. xxxi. 13, 14; xxxv. 2, 3; Numb. xv. 32—36). To them it commemorated the rest after the Creation and the rest after the toils of Egypt, while it looked forward to the rest of Canaan while they wandered in the wilderness (Ps. xcvi. 11), and, after they had entered Canaan, to the still further rest of the Messianic kingdom (Heb. iv. 8); and it was to be kept with such severity that no work at all was to be done upon it, even to the extent of gathering sticks or lighting a fire.

III. **ENDS SERVED BY THE JEWISH FORM.** 1. It formed a very noticeable distinction between the Jews and the neighbouring nations, and so it was a preservative from idolatry. 2. It served, like circumcision, as a symbol constantly reminding them that they were God's people, and should live in accordance with their profession. "Moreover also I gave them my sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them" (Ezek. xx. 12).

IV. **THE CHRISTIAN FORM.** Christ declared his lordship over the sabbath day (Matt.

xii. 8), but he did not exercise that lordship for the purpose of destroying it as an institution, but merely of adapting the primary law of the sabbath to altered circumstances. The Jewish sabbath, as such (that is, in its peculiarities), ceased to be binding, but the obligation of sabbatical law continued, and the ordinance took a changed form. By apostolic authority, as proved by apostolic practice, the Christian sabbath was kept on the first day of the week—the anniversary of Christ's resurrection—and the severity of its character was abrogated. As God had rested on the seventh day after his labour of creation, so Christ had rested in the grave on the seventh day after his labour of redemption. Why should the seventh day be any longer kept? "The Jewish sabbath died out in the course of the first generation of Christians, as circumcision died out, as the temple, as the Law itself died out. . . . The Lord's day was a Divine and more immortal shoot from the same stock. It was rooted in the primitive law of the Creation. It recognized and adopted the old weekly division of time, that perpetual and ever-recurring acknowledgment, wherever it was celebrated in all the world, of the Divine blessing and promises. It had the Divine sanction of the tables of stone—those tables, written by God's own finger, and therefore greatly superior in sanctity and enduring weight to the temporary enactments of the ceremonial law. It took up the old series of commemorations and sacred anticipations. It bade the true Israel of God record with gratitude and keep in mind, by the weekly institution and its recurring festival of rest and praise, the creation of mankind, the deliverance from Egypt, the entrance of the people into the promised land, the return from captivity, the coming of the Messiah; and to look forward under the dispensation of the Holy Ghost to the crowning and final mercy of the long scheme of Providence, the eternal rest in heaven which yet remaineth for the people of God" (Bishop Moberly, 'The Law of the Love of God').

V. THE ENDS OF THE SABBATICAL INSTITUTION. 1. To reserve a certain sufficient part of time free for spiritual interests. 2. To teach the lesson of obedience to positive precept in religious things. The appointment of one-seventh of our time for this purpose is wholly arbitrary. There is no account to be given of it except that it is God's will. There is no other account to be given of weeks. Months and years have their reasons in physical nature; not so weeks. God has commanded, and because he has commanded, the weekly rest is observed by those who love God; and not only is the weekly rest observed, but a loving obedience is paid to all religious institutions and ordinances established by lawful authority.

VI. EFFECT ON THE INDIVIDUAL CHRISTIAN'S LIFE. "The Christian man, desirous of loving God with all the affection of his heart, with all the rational intelligence of his mind, with all the devotion of his life, with all the energy of his strength, in the love taught him under the fourth law, will yield himself up gratefully and religiously to obey all duly ordered positive laws of the Church of God. The Sunday and its sacred observance will be to him the centre, and furnish, so to speak, the form of his own way of life, and that of all his family and dependents. He will regard it every time it returns as God's holy day of rest, the weekly commemoration of the primeval rest of God and of all the signal mercies of the elder covenant. Knowing himself to be of the true Israel of God, he will not forget the blessings connected by God himself with the sabbatical institution, vouchsafed to his fathers in the faith. He will celebrate it weekly as the feast of the Lord's resurrection, and all the blessings of that resurrection; as the feast of the Holy Ghost the Giver of peace and rest in the Church, as the weekly antepast of that glorious and unending rest in the presence of God which still remaineth for the people of God. It will be to him a day of rest, peace, prayer, praise, and holy joy; no mournful and austere time, but on the contrary, a thankful happy time. He will remember his Lord's injunction not to forbid or refuse works of necessity or mercy on that day. He will gratefully shut up the records of the cares, the interests, and the occupations of the week, and give that holy day to God; not discharging himself of his duties of worship by an attendance in God's house or holding himself at liberty to make his own convenience or inclination the rule of obedience; but faithfully, dutifully, and completely sanctifying that day to rest, worship, and the thought of God and heaven. And the other days, the train of Sunday, will borrow of its light; each having its own sacred, special commemoration belonging to it, and each reflecting some of the brightness of the Sunday just preceding and catching more and more from that which follows" (Moberly, 'The Law of the Love of God').

VII. RESULTS OF ITS NEGLECT. 1. To the individual : (1) an unloving spirit arising from a consciousness of disobedience to a command ; (2) a habit of refusing to submit to positive injunctions, and, growing out of that, a habit of choosing which of God's commandments he will obey ; (3) a loss of religious opportunities, and consequently a gradual falling away from the habit of public worship, and therefore from the spiritual life ; (4) a sense of being overwhelmed by the business and worries of life which continue without cessation, and thence a want of calm peacefulness and cheerfulness. 2. To a nation : (1) growth of ungodliness and irreligion ; (2) increase of self-indulgence and mere amusement-seeking ; (3) growing oppression of the poor, who are made to serve the amusements or requirements of the rich instead of enjoying their weekly rest and refreshment of body and mind and soul ; (4) the displeasure of God, whose primeval law is disobeyed.

Ver. 4.—This verse contains the laws of piety and of faith. “*Turn ye not unto idols*” forbids the worship of false gods ; “*nor make to yourselves molten gods*” forbids in addition the sin of worshipping the true God under the form of a molten shape.

I. The great temptation to the Jews down to the time of their captivity appears to have been that of taking the gods of the nations round about them as their gods ; Baal, Ashtoreth, Molech, Chemosh, drew off their affections from Jehovah. They did not desire apparently to give up the worship of God altogether, but to combine the worship of false gods with it, that is, to transfer a part of the religious affections which were due to God to some other object. This is done in the present day, (1) by the Roman Catholic Church, which sanctions the transference of worship which ought to be confined to God, from him to St. Mary and other saints ; and the moral and religious regard, which is due to God alone, not only to saints, but to a living man, who has been called the idol of the Vatican ; (2) by worldly men, who occupy their thoughts and feeling to such an excessive degree with the things of sense as to shut out Divine and spiritual things ; (3) by sophists, who, by the exercise of a subtle intellect in a presumptuous spirit, shut out God from their ken, and worship the universe, or humanity, or nothing.

II. The Jews were also guilty of the kindred sin of worshipping Jehovah under the form of an idol. This was the sin of Aaron's calf, which represented, not any strange god, but Jehovah himself (Exod. xxxii. 5), and this was the case with Jeroboam's two calves of gold (1 Kings xii. 26—33). This offence is committed by any Christians who adore a representation of the Deity, sculptured or painted, or any sign or symbol of him, of whatever material or appearance it may be. It is the sin of men or Churches which have faith to believe that there is a God, but so feeble a faith that they require visible symbols of his presence instead of bravely trusting in the Unseen. The Israelites said to Aaron, “Up, make us gods, which shall go before us ; for as for this Moses, the man that brought us up out of the land of Egypt, we wot not what is become of him.” When they could not see Moses, the servant of God, they required a visible image of God. They could not trust him unseen ; they required proof of his nearness ; and this craving of a feeble faith led them to prefer the symbol of “a calf that eateth hay” (Deut. iv. 15) to no similitude at all. “Other nations, surrounding the Jews on every side, had their visible objects of worship, making their task of Divine duty and faith more easy. But to acquiesce in their unseen God, *I am* ; to obey without immediate continual consciousness of his nearness ; to trust in his protection at times when they had no sensible aid to help them to realize to their imagination his power ; to let loose, as it were, their prayers into the air, without having some representative figure, or emblem, at the least, at which to point them ;—all this was too difficult a task for a feeble faith in things invisible and spiritual” (Moberly, ‘The Law of the Love of God’).

The same feebleness of faith has produced the worship of images in the Christian Church. It was not till the seventh century that they crept into use for aids in worship, and when they were approved in the eighth century by the second Council of Nicaea, that Council was at once rejected, and its doctrine of images was repudiated by the Council of Frankfort and the bishops of Charlemagne's empire.

In like manner, a feeble faith craves for full light, for demonstration, for infallibility, where God has only given twilight moral certainty, and an authority which is not abso-

lute. It craves for immediate resolution of spiritual difficulties where God demands a patient dealing with them ; it asks after a sign where no sign is to be given ; it seeks out for itself mediators instead of going straight to God.

Not only does the use of images in worship arise from a feeble faith, but it makes that faith feebler and feebler, and thus leads to materialism. After a while the symbol becomes substituted for the thing symbolized by it, and the affections which the emblem was intended to excite toward an unseen object, do not pass beyond the external sign. Materialism and weakness of faith are the spiritual effects of worshipping images and craving after visible symbols.

“A brave contentment with an invisible God, showing itself in faithful and strong-hearted maintenance of piety in the absence (if it should so please God) or the apparent scantiness of signs, tokens, miracles, and other visible indications of the presence and protection of the Omnipresent and Omnipotent, and a like courageous and faithful abstinence from making to themselves unauthorized images, symbols, and emblems of him who communicated with the people without similitude, must be the particular quality or part of Divine love enjoined under the second law. The peculiar affection enjoined is the brave, trusting, spiritual faith in God invisible, spiritual, absent to our sense, dim in his tokens, obscure sometimes in his providences, not demonstrable in his evidences, not invariable in his benefits. . . . Possessed of this spiritual faith in the Unseen, a man walks along his narrow path of life with a confidence, security, and cheerfulness which establish at once his comfort and his safety” (Moberly, “The Law of the Love of God”).

Vera. 9, 10.—*The law of kindness is a necessary complement to the other laws*, to make up the perfect character. A stern, just man is not the Christian ideal. The mercy and loving-kindness of God must be our model, as well as his other qualities.

“The quality of mercy . . . is twice blessed ;  
It blesseth him that gives, and him that takes.”

The man who leaves something for others that he might have taken for himself, such as the gleanings of his field, rises from the level of justice to that of generosity, and is educated to understand the noble impulses of a liberal heart and the blessedness described in the one saying of our Lord that is not recounted in the Gospels, “It is more blessed to give than to receive.”

Vera. 11, 13, 35, 36.—*Stealing is forbidden by the law of man, and by the Law of God.* It is forbidden by the law of man in order to prevent injury being done to a citizen, and its sanction is fear of punishment. Remove the fear of punishment, and the goods of another will no longer be respected. It is forbidden by the Law of God because it is displeasing to God ; because honesty and uprightness are in themselves right ; because to defraud another is in itself wrong. Take away the fear of punishment, and there will remain as scrupulous a care not to trespass on the rights of another as before. The law of honesty, as inculcated by God, has a dominating power and influence in all conditions of life.

Cheating is to stealing as equivocation is to lying. Both are equally immoral. Cheating and equivocating only differ morally from stealing and lying by being more mean and cowardly. The law of man cannot prevent cheating. It can indeed send inspectors to see that there are “*just balances, just weights, a just ephah, and a just hin*” ; but that is not enough to prevent cheating. The only thing that will do this is the fear of the Lord and the consciousness that the unjust appropriation of anything, however small, is contrary to the will of God. Hence we may see the infinite importance for the well-being of a country that the moral teaching of children in public schools be rested upon a religious basis. The precept is reproduced in the New Testament : “Let him that stole steal no more : but rather let him labour, working with his hands the thing which is good, that he may have to give to him that needeth” (Eph. iv. 28).

Lying is joined with stealing and cheating, not only because it may be used as a means of cheating (ch. vi. 2), but because it is a fraud in itself and a sin against uprightness and honesty. The essence of the sin consists in deceiving our neighbours. “Men,

as men," says Bishop Taylor, "have a right to truth;" "for there is in mankind a universal contract implied in all their intercourses, and words being instituted to declare the mind, and for no other end, he that hears me speak hath a right in justice to be done him that, as far as I can, what I speak be true; for else he by words does not know your mind, and then as good and better not speak at all" ('Ductor Dubitantium,' 3, 2, 5). There are certain classes of men who have not a right to truth, such as madmen, and sick persons under special circumstances; and in these cases it is justifiable to say to them what is best for them, whether true or not; and in case of declared war the right to truth ceases, and is known to cease, so that no immoral deception takes place when false news is spread or stratagems adopted. But in time of peace and in ordinary cases, "Thou shalt not deceive thy neighbour" is the rule of conduct. Whether this deception takes place by means of a lie, or of an equivocation, or of a mental reservation makes no difference in the morality of the act. The defence of equivocation rests upon a confusion of two things totally different—material truth and moral truthfulness. The statement that the sun rises or sinks is materially false, because it remains stationary. But the man who makes such a statement is morally truthful, if he makes it not intending to deceive his neighbour and knowing that he will not be deceived. A statement that the sun had not risen (in the morning) or gone down (in the evening), if made with the purpose of deceiving the person addressed, and with an ulterior object on the part of the speaker, although materially true, would imply moral untruthfulness on the part of the speaker, and therefore is a lie. Bishop Taylor and Sanderson were some of the first theologians who, recurring to the severer morality of Augustine and the early Fathers, cast away with scorn the puerile confusion between moral truthfulness and material truth on which the system of modern Roman casuistry in this department rests. "He that tells a lie," says Bishop Taylor, "and by his mental restriction says he tells a truth, tells two lies" ('Ductor Dubitantium,' iii. 28). On the other hand, the Church of Rome teaches that the person addressed may be deceived to any amount, provided that the deception is effected by a form of words which is true in some sense apprehended by the speaker, though untrue in the sense understood by the other party. Accordingly, it is taught by an authority that may not be gainsaid by any member of that communion, that if a man prefixes the words "I say that" to a sentence, he may with a good reason make any false statement that he pleases, because in his own mind he means only to declare that he is making use of the words following that prefix, not that he is asserting their truth, as the person that he addresses supposes him to be doing (S. Alfonso de' Liguori, 'Theol. Moral.', iv. 451). Contrast with this the injunctions of the apostle, "Wherefore putting away lying, speak every man truth with his neighbour: for we are members one of another" (Eph. iv. 25); "Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the old man with his deeds" (Col. iii. 9); and the command of the prophet, "Speak ye every man the truth to his neighbour; execute the judgment of truth and peace in your gates: and let none of you imagine evil in your hearts against his neighbour; and love no false oath: for all these are things that I hate, saith the Lord" (Zech. viii. 16, 17); and the teaching of the early Church, "A man lies when he thinks something to be false and says it as though true, whether it be true or false. Mark the addition that I have made. Whether it be really true or false, yet, if a man thinks it false and assert it as true, he lies, for he is aiming to deceive. . . . His heart is double, not single; he does but bring out what he has there" (St. Augustine, 'Serm.' 133); and the teaching of the reformed Church, "Our result is that the party swearing after this manner both sinneth in his equivocal oath, and is notwithstanding that tacit equivocation bound in conscience unto the performance of his promise in that sense which the words yield of themselves, and are, without constraint, apt to beget upon the minds of others. Unless he act accordingly, he is not guiltless of perjury" (Sanderson, 'Obligation of Oaths'). In the Book of the Revelation we read, "But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone" (Rev. xxi. 8).

Ver. 12, "Ye shall not swear by my Name falsely, neither shalt thou profane the Name of thy God," contains three injunctions: First, a command that on due occasions we are to make appeal to God by solemn oath; secondly, a prohibition of perjury; thirdly, a command to reverence God's Name.

I. TO SWEAR BY GOD'S NAME IS COMMANDED, AS BEING A RECOGNITION OF HIM AS SUPREME LORD. Thus in Deuteronomy we read, "Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and serve him, and shalt swear by his Name" (vi. 13); in the Psalms, "Every one that sweareth by him shall glory (or be commended)" (lxiii. 11); in Isaiah, "He that sweareth in the earth shall swear by the God of truth" (lxv. 16); in Jeremiah, "Thou shalt swear, The Lord liveth, in truth, in judgment, and in righteousness" (iv. 2); "Thy children have forsaken me, and sworn by them that are no gods" (v. 7); "And it shall come to pass, if they will diligently learn the ways of my people, to swear by my Name, The Lord liveth; as they taught my people to swear by Baal; then shall they be built in the midst of my people" (xii. 16).

II. GOD SWEARS BY HIMSELF. "By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord, for because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son: that in blessing I will bless thee" (Gen. xxii. 16, 17). "I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, That unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear" (Isa. xlvi. 23). "For when God made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater, he aware by himself, saying, Surely blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply thee. . . . Wherein God, willing more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath: that by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation" (Heb. vi. 13-18).

III. GOD'S COMMAND MADE OF NONE EFFECT BY JEWISH TRADITIONS. These are summed up in the following passage of Philo Judæus:—"Let the word of the good man be a firm oath, immovable trust, free from falsehood, based on truth. But if this be not sufficient, and necessity compel him to swear, he should swear by the health or sacred age of his father or mother if they are alive, or by their memory if they are dead. For they are images and representations of Divine power, inasmuch as they brought into being those that did not exist before. They too deserve praise who, when they are compelled to swear, suggest the thought of reverence both to the bystanders and to those who impose the oath by the limitation and unwillingness which they show. For, saying aloud, 'Yes, by \_\_\_\_,' and, 'No, by \_\_\_\_,' and adding nothing, under the appearance of sudden interruption, they show that they do not swear a complete oath. But let a man add thereto what he pleases, such as the earth, the sun, the stars, the heaven, the whole world, provided he does not add the highest and most awful Cause" ('De Special. Legibus').

IV. CHRIST FORBIDS SWEARING. "Ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths: but I say unto you, Swear not at all; neither by heaven; for it is God's throne: nor by the earth; for it is his footstool: neither by Jerusalem; for it is the city of the great King. Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black. But let your communication be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil" (Matt. v. 33-37). Nearly the same words are repeated in Jas. v. 12.

V. CHRIST'S COMMAND LIMITED IN ITS EXTENT. His prohibition refers to ordinary swearing, not to solemn oaths taken in courts of justice or under similar circumstances. This is plain by the fact that at his own trial he replied to the adjuration of the high priest, which adjuration was the Jewish manner of taking an oath in a court of justice, "Jesus held his peace. And the high priest answered and said unto him, I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God. Jesus said unto him, Thou hast said" (Matt. xxvi. 63, 64). Because the high priest's words were "the voice of swearing" (ch. v. 1), Jesus broke his silence and spoke in obedience to the adjuration; and oaths are spoken of with approval in the Epistle to the Hebrews (vi. 13-18).

VI. WHAT AN OATH IS. It is an appeal to the tribunal of God, the person swearing (or adjured) calling God to witness to the truth of his words. Its purpose is "an end of all strife" (Heb. vi. 16). When no circumstantial evidence is forthcoming, the only means of arriving at truth is the awe of God solemnly invoked by an oath, and the dread of offending him by perjury. Where either sophistical casuistry or a secret—still more an open—scepticism undermines or destroys the sense of the obligation of oaths in a nation, that nation is hurrying on its way to destruction.

VII. PERJURY. The more solemn an oath is, the greater is the sin of perjury. If to swear by God's Name is a method of arriving at truth appointed by God himself, to swear by his Name falsely subverts the purpose of the command and insults the majesty of God.

VIII. IRREVERENCE. Not only deliberate perjury but any kind of irreverence is forbidden by this injunction. "The Christian man . . . will endeavour to recognize with faithful respect that holy Name wherever it meets him in his walk of life. As it is an appellation of the most high God, he will never utter it hastily or thoughtlessly. He will surely not use it at all except he have occasion to speak of it seriously and carefully. It is needless to say how totally he will refrain from such wanton profanation as that of garnishing his common speech by using the Name or referring to the doings of the Most High; still less how impossible it would be for him to allege the sacred Name, literally or by implication, in support of falsehood; nay, how impossible it would be that he should assert what is false at all, seeing that the Name of God is all around him, and that the most secularly sounding asseverations are nothing else than allegations of that Name. He will be much on his guard in prayers, lest, while he utters the sacred Name and the words which belong to it, his mind should wander away from the thoughts which ought to accompany it, and he should break the commandment. He will not shrink from the seemly reverence which the Church orders to be paid to the Name of Christ" (Moberly, 'The Law of the Love of God').

Vers. 18, 34.—We have the testimony of our Lord (Matt. xxii. 9) and of the Apostle St. Paul (Rom. xiii. 9; Gal. v. 14) that to obey the injunction, "*Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself*," is to fulfil all the commandments of the second table of the Law; and for that reason St. James calls it a royal law (Jas. ii. 8). Here, therefore, the Levitical Law culminates in its highest point, so far as our duties towards men are concerned. Lest the Jew should confine the idea of *thy neighbour* to his own kindred and race, an equal love is specifically commanded for *the stranger that dwelleth with you*. Not only, *Thou shalt love thy Jewish neighbour as thyself*, but also *Thou shalt love the stranger that dwelleth among you as thyself*. The force of the comparison, *as thyself*, may be studied in Bishop Butler's sermon 'Upon the Love of our Neighbour.'

But though the Law culminates in the two kindred commands, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God;" "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself;" Christianity does not. Christianity goes beyond the highest point to which the Law soars. Not only does it name the neighbour and the stranger as those whom we are to love, but also the enemy. "Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven" (Matt. v. 43—45). The motive in the gospel is also higher than the Law. In the Law the motive in the case of the stranger is human sympathy arising from common suffering, "for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt." In the gospel it is the desire to be like God in his dealings with men, "for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust" (Matt. v. 45), "for he is kind unto the unthankful and to the evil. Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father also is merciful" (Luke vi. 35, 36).

Ver. 19.—The moral meaning of the command, "*Thou shalt not sow thy field with mingled seed*," receives an illustration from the parable of the "man which sowed good seed in his field: but while men slept, his enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat, and went his way. But when the blade was sprung up, and brought forth fruit, then appeared the tares also" (Matt. xiii. 24—26). God's servant must sow of the best; if the tares are mixed with the good seed, it must be the enemy's doing, not his. One of the preparations made by the Jews for an approaching Passover was to go over the fields near Jerusalem, and root up plants that had grown from *mingled seeds*. But in the spiritual sphere this is not to be done. If the enemy has succeeded in introducing the tares, they are for the sake of the wheat to be let to grow together until the harvest (Matt. xiii. 30).

Ver. 32.—*Respect for old age* is not only inculcated as a preservative against the rule of brute force, but as a part of the fear of God, the parent's relation to the child representing that of God to his creature.

Ver. 37.—*Moral commandments have a double sanction.* They are to be obeyed (1) because they carry their own sanction with them, (2) because they are commanded. In the latter respect all Divine injunctions stand on a level. All transgressions of what is commanded are equally sin, but they are not equal sins. A man who steals is not guilty of an equally heinous sin with the man who commits murder, but he is equally guilty of sin, because both murder and theft are forbidden. *All God's statutes, and all his judgments are to be observed without exception, in order to be righteous according to the righteousness of the Law.* “For Moses describeth the righteousness which is of the Law, That the man which doeth those things shall live by them” (Rom. x. 5). “This do, and ye shall live” (Luke xi. 28).

#### HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

Vers. 1, 2, 4, 5, 12, 26—28, 30—32, 36, 37.—*Religion and superstition.* It is not always easy or even possible to distinguish between religion and superstition. We may fall into the latter when we are seeking to practise the former; or we may, from undue fear of the latter, neglect the former. In this chapter the Jews were taught (and we are thereby encouraged) to avoid the one, and to perfect the other in the fear of God.

I. THE SUPERSTITION WHICH WAS TO BE SHUNNED. 1. Clearly and decisively everything that was in any way *idolatrous* was condemned; “turn ye not unto idols” (ver. 4). 2. All that was distinctively or closely connected with heathen worship was also forbidden: the use of enchantments, the superstitious observance of lucky or unlucky times, also superstitious cutting of the hair or of the flesh (vers. 26—28); resorting to wizards, etc. (see 1 Chron. x. 13). There is amongst us much adoption of practices which are idle and vain, not warranted in Scripture nor founded on reason. Such things are to be deprecated and shunned. They are (1) useless; (2) harmful, as taking the place in our thought which belongs to something really good and wise; (3) displeasing to the God of truth.

II. THE RELIGION WHICH WAS TO BE CULTIVATED AND PRACTISED. The Jews were to cherish and cultivate, even as we are, (1) sanctity like that of God himself (ver. 2), entire separateness of spirit and so of conduct from every evil thing; (2) reverence for his holy Name (ver. 12), and consequent abstention from everything bordering on profanity; (3) regard for divinely appointed ordinances—the sabbath and the sanctuary (ver. 30); (4) gratitude for his redeeming mercy (ver. 36), “I am the Lord your God, which brought you out of the land of Egypt;” (5) spontaneous dedication to his service (ver. 5). “At our own will” we must bring ourselves and our offerings to his altar; (6) daily, hourly consultation of his holy will, “Therefore shall ye observe all my statutes, and all my judgments, and do them” (ver. 37).—C.

Vers. 3, 32.—“*Honour to whom honour.*” It is uncertain whether we shall receive the honour which is due to us. Possibly we may be denied some to which we are entitled; probably we have experienced this wrong already, in larger or smaller measure, and know the pain of heart which attends it. Let us, therefore, resolve that we will give that which is due to others. The two passages connected in the text remind us that we should pay deference to—

I. THOSE WHO CARRY THE WEIGHT OF YEARS. “Thou shalt rise up before the hoary head, and honour the face of the old man.” “Respect the burden, madam,” said Napoleon, inviting a lady to move out of the way of one who was carrying a heavy weight. Those who have travelled far on the rough road of life, and are worn with many and sad experiences, on whom the privations of age are resting,—these carry a heavy weight, a burden we should respect. They are as wounded soldiers on whom the battle of life has left its scars, and these are marks of honour that demand the tribute of youth.

II. THOSE WHO HAVE ATTAINED TO WISDOM. The young are apt to think that they

can reach the heights of wisdom without laboriously climbing the steeps of experience. They find that they are wrong. Time proves to each generation of men that wisdom, whether it be that of earth or of heaven, is only gained by the discipline of life. There are men who pass through human life and learn nothing in the passage; the folly of youth cleaves to them still. Such men must be comparatively unhonoured, receiving only the respect which is due to old age as such. But when men have gathered the fruits of a long and large experience—and especially when men of intelligence and piety have stored up the truth which God has been teaching them as he has led them along all the path of life—they are worthy to receive our sincerest honour, and we must know how to "rise up before the hoary head" in their case. With all and more than all the respect we pay to the learned, we should receive men whom God has been long teaching in his school—those who have learnt much of Jesus Christ.

III. THOSE WHO HAVE LAID US UNDER SPECIAL OBLIGATION. 1. Aged men who have lived a faithful life have done this. For they have lived, not only for themselves, but for their kind. They have wrought, struggled, suffered in order that they might help us and others to walk in the light, to enter the kingdom, to enjoy the favour of God; and they have earned our gratitude by their faithful service. 2. Our parents have done this also. "Ye shall fear every man his mother, and his father." What benefits our parents have conferred on us, what kindnesses they have rendered us, what sacrifices they have made for us, what anxious thought and earnest prayer they have cherished and offered on our behalf—who of us shall reckon? The debt we owe to them for all they have done for us is the heaviest of all, next to that supreme indebtedness under which we stand to God. But it is not only the obligation we have thus incurred which demands our filial reverence; it is the fact that our parents are—

IV. THOSE WHO STAND IN A SPECIAL RELATIONSHIP TO US. 1. We should remember that fatherhood is the human relationship which most closely resembles and most fully reveals that in which God himself stands to us all. Christ came to reveal the Father unto man as the Father of souls. Therefore it is to be highly honoured. 2. Fatherhood (parenthood, for the mother is not to be left out of our thought) in the best state of human society has received the largest share of honour. We may gather from this fact that it is a divinely implanted instinct, only absent when the race has miserably degenerated under sin. 3. Honour given to parents as such is imperatively required by God. It was a patriarchal and Jewish, as it is now a Christian, virtue. After the injunction stand these significant words, "I am the Lord." "Children, obey your parents in the Lord" (Eph. vi. 1). Filial disobedience and unkindness are grievous sins in his sight. Filial love, honour, and considerateness are well-pleasing unto the Lord.—C.

Vers. 9, 10, 13, 14, 33, 34.—*Considerateness.* We gather from these verses—

I. THAT THE FEAR OF GOD WILL SURELY LEAD TO THE LOVE OF MAN. That piety which begins and ends in acts of devotion is one that may be reasonably suspected: it is not of the scriptural order. True piety is in consulting the will of the heavenly Father (Matt. vii. 21), and his will is that we should love and be kind to one another (Eph. iv. 32). Philanthropy is a word which may not have its synonym in the Old Testament, but the Hebrew legislator was not ignorant of the idea, and the Hebrew people were not left without incitement to the thing itself. Hence these injunctions to leave some corn in the corners of their fields, and the scattered ears for the reaping and gleaning of the poor (ver. 9); to leave also some clusters of grapes which had been overlooked for needy hands to pluck (ver. 10); to take no advantage of the weaker members of their society, the deaf and the blind (ver. 14); and to show kindness to the stranger (ver. 34).

II. THAT CONSIDERATENESS IS A GRACE WHICH IS PECULIARLY PLEASING TO GOD. The Jews were expressly enjoined to (1) show kindness to the poor (ver. 10); (2) to be careful of those who suffered from bodily infirmity (ver. 14); (3) to interest themselves in the stranger (vers. 33, 34). There is something particularly striking in the commandment that they were to refrain from cursing the deaf. Even though there might be no danger of giving positive pain and exciting resentment, yet they were not to direct harsh words against any one of their more unfortunate brethren. This legislation for the weak and the necessitous presents a very pleasant aspect of the Law. It also

reminds us of some truths which come home to ourselves. We may observe: 1. That power is apt to be tyrannical. The history of nations, tribes, individuals, is the history of assertion and assumption. The strong have ever shown themselves ready to take advantage of the weak. Hence the oppression and cruelty which darken the pages of human history. 2. That God would have us be just to one another. In most cases, if not in all, we can take no credit for our superior strength, and build no claim on it. In many cases, if not in most, we can impute no blame to others for their weakness: the unfortunate are not necessarily the undeserving, and we have no right to make them suffer. 3. But beyond this, God would have us be specially kind to the necessitous *because they are needy*. Here are these statutes in respect of the poor, the afflicted, and the stranger. The devotional Scriptures speak more fully of this sacred duty (Ps. xli. 1, 2; lxii. 13; cxii. 9, etc.). The prophets utter their voice still more forcibly (Isa. lviii. 6—8; Ezek. xviii. 7; Neh. v. 10—12; Jer. xxii. 16; Amos iv. 1, etc.). Our Lord has, with strongest emphasis, commanded to us considerateness toward the weak and helpless (Matt. x. 42; xviii. 6, 10, 14; xxv. 34—40, etc.). His apostles spoke and wrote in the same strain (Rom. xii. 15; 1 Cor. xii. 26, etc.). But that which, above everything, should lead us to be considerate toward the poorer and weaker members of our community is the thought that to do so is *so truly and emphatically Divine*. God himself has ever been acting on this gracious principle. He interposed to save the children of Israel because they were weak and afflicted. Again and again he stretched out his arm of deliverance, saving them from the strong and the mighty of the earth. On this Divine principle he deals with us all. He “knows our frame, and remembers that we are dust.” “Like as a father pities his children, so he pities them that fear him.” Our Saviour dealt with exquisite considerateness in all his relations to his undiscerning and unappreciative disciples; and now he is dealing with gracious forbearance toward us in all the weakness, poverty, shortcoming of our service. We are never so much like our merciful Master as when we speak and act considerately toward those who are poorer, weaker, and more helpless than ourselves.—C.

Vers. 11, 13, 15, 16, 35, 36.—*Integrity*. The Jews have always been considered a cunning and crafty race; they have been credited with a willingness to overreach in business dealings. Men would rather have transactions with others than with them, lest they should find themselves worsted in the bargain. This suspicion may be well founded; but if it be so, it ought to be remembered that it is the consequence of the long and cruel disadvantages under which they have suffered, and is not due to anything in their own blood or to any defect in their venerable Law. From the beginning they have been as strictly charged to live honourable and upright lives before man as to engage regularly in the worship of God. They have been as much bound to integrity of conduct as to devoutness of spirit. In these few verses we find them called to—

I. INTEGRITY IN DAILY TRANSACTIONS—HONESTY. “Ye shall not steal, neither deal falsely” (ver. 11). “Thou shalt not defraud thy neighbour, neither rob him” (ver. 13; see vers. 35, 36). Nothing could be more explicit than this, nothing more comprehensive in suggestion. No member of the Hebrew commonwealth could (1) deliberately appropriate what he knew was not his own, or (2) rob his neighbour in the act of trading, or (3) deal falsely or unrighteously in any transaction or in any relation, without consciously breaking the Law and coming under the displeasure of Jehovah. The words of the Law are clear and strong, going straight to the understanding and to the conscience. Every man amongst them must have known, as every one amongst us knows well, that dishonesty is sin in the sight of God.

II. INTEGRITY IN OFFICIAL DUTY—JUSTICE. (Ver. 15.) It is a pitiful thought that, in every nation, justice has been open to corruption; that men placed in honourable posts in order to do justice between man and man have either sold it to the highest bidder or surrendered and betrayed it from craven fear. God’s clear word condemns such rank injustice, and his high displeasure follows the perpetrator of it. He who undertakes to judge his fellows must do so in the fear of God, and if he swerves from his integrity in his public acts, he must lay his account with heaven if not with man.

III. INTEGRITY IN WORD—TRUTH. “Ye shall not lie one to another” (ver. 11).

This, too, is a universal sin. Some nations may be more prone to it than others. The weak and the oppressed are too ready to take refuge in it; it is the resort of the feeble and the fearful. But it is also used with shameful freedom and shocking unconcern, as an instrument of gain and power. God has revealed his holy hatred of it. "Ye shall not lie." "Lying lips are abomination to the Lord;" "the Lord hateth a lying tongue" (Prov. xii. 22; vi. 17). Under the gospel of Christ, we are earnestly warned against it (Eph. iv. 25; Col. iii. 9). We are reminded that it is (1) a wrong done to our fellow-men ("we are members," etc.), and (2) closely associated with heathen habits (the "old man," etc.); and we may remember that it is (3) a habit most demoralizing to ourselves, as well as (4) something which utterly separates us from our Lord, being so contrary to his Spirit and so grievous in his sight.—C.

Vers. 17, 18.—*Love—its root and its fruit.* Two things lend a special interest to this passage. 1. It was twice quoted by our Lord (Matt. xix. 19 and xxii. 39). 2. It shows us the Law as closer to the gospel than we are apt to think; it proves that, under the old dispensation, God was not satisfied with a mere mechanical propriety of behaviour, that he demanded rightness of feeling as well as correctness of conduct. We have—

I. THE BROAD PRINCIPLE OF GOD'S REQUIREMENT. Man is to "love his neighbour as himself" (ver. 18). No man, indeed, can (1) give as much time and thought to each of his neighbours as he does to himself, and no man (2) is so responsible for the state of others' hearts and the rectitude of their lives as he is for his own. But every man can and should, by power of imagination and sympathy, put himself in his brother's place; be as anxious to avoid doing injury to another as he would be unwilling to receive injury from another; and be as desirous of doing good to his neighbour who is in need as he would be eager to receive help from him if he himself were in distress. This is the essence of the "golden rule" (Matt. vii. 12).

II. THE ROOT FROM WHICH THIS FEELING WILL SPRING. How can we do this? it will be asked. How can we be interested in the uninteresting; love the unamiable; go out in warm affection toward those who have in them so much that is repulsive? The answer is here, "I am the Lord." We must look at all men in their relation to God. 1. God is interested, Christ is interested in the worst of men, is seeking to save and raise them; do we not care for those for whom he cares so much? 2. They are all God's children; it may be his prodigal children, living in the far country, but still his sons and daughters, over whom he yearns. 3. The most unlovely of men are those for whom our Saviour bled, agonized, died. Can we be indifferent to them? 4. They were once not far from the kingdom, and may yet be holy citizens of the kingdom of God. When we look at our fellow-men in the light of their relation to God, to Jesus Christ, we can see that in them which shined through all that is repelling, and which attracts us to their side that we may win and bless them.

III. THE FRUITS WHICH HOLY LOVE WILL BEAR. There are two suggested in the text. 1. *Forbearance*; "not hating our brother in our heart," "not avenging or bearing any grudge against" him. Without the restraints and impulses of piety we are under irresistible temptation to do this. Unreasonable dislike on our brother's part, injustice, ingratitude, unkindness, inconsiderateness, features of character which are antipathetic to our own,—these things and such things as these are provocative of ill will, dislike, enmity, resentment, even revenge on our part. But if we remember and realize our brother's relation to the common Father and Saviour, we shall rise to the noble height of forbearance; we shall have the love which "beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things" (1 Cor. xiii. 7). 2. *Restoration by remonstrance*; "Thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbour, and not suffer sin upon him." Instead of nursing and nourishing our indignation, allowing our brother to go on in the wrong, and permitting ourselves to become resentful as well as indignant, we shall offer the remonstrance of affection; we shall "reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering" (2 Tim. iv. 2). We shall try to win our brother back to that path of truth or righteousness which he has forsaken; so shall we "gain our brother" (Matt. xviii. 15), instead of "suffering sin upon him." This is the conquest of love, the crown of charity.—C.

Ver. 19.—*Aids to purity.* We shall first consider—

I. **WHAT WAS THE PRIMARY PURPORT OF THIS TRIPLE LAW.** We need not be surprised if we find here another aid to purity of heart and life, another fence thrown up against immorality. Idolatry and immorality, both of the very worst description, had covered and dishonoured the land of Canaan. It was of the last importance that the people of God should be guarded in every possible way against infection and guilt. Therefore the wise and holy Lawgiver instituted various measures by which his people should be perpetually reminded that they must be absolutely free from these heinous crimes. And therefore precepts which intimated the will of Jehovah in this matter were bound up with their daily callings and their domestic life. Our text is an illustration. In the management of their cattle, in the cultivation of their fields, in the making and wearing of their clothes, God was whispering in their ear, "Be pure of heart and life." Everything impressed upon their minds—these precise injunctions among other statutes—that there must be no joining together of that which God had put asunder, no mingling of those who should keep apart, no "defilement" (see Deut. xxii. 9), no "confusion" (ch. xx. 12). By laws which had such continually recurring illustration they would have inwrought into the very texture of their minds the idea that, if they wished to retain their place as the people of God, they must be pure of heart and life.

II. **SECONDARY TRUTHS WHICH THIS LAW SUGGESTS.** 1. It suggests simplicity in worship; there may be such an admixture of the divinely appointed and the humanly imported, of the spiritual and the artistic, of the heavenly and the worldly, that the excellency and the acceptableness will be lost and gone. 2. It suggests sincerity in service; in the service of the sanctuary or the sabbath school, or in any sphere of sacred usefulness, there may be such a mingling of the higher and the lower motives, of the generous and the selfish, of the nobler and the meeker, that the "wood, hay, and stubble" weigh more than the "gold, silver, and precious stones" in the balances of heaven, and then the workman will "lose his reward." 3. It suggests also the wisdom of taking special securities against specially strong temptations. God gave his people very many and (what seem to us) even singular securities against the rampant and deadly evil which had ruined their predecessors and might reach and slay them also. The circumstances and conditions of the time demanded them. Exceptional and imperious necessity not only justifies but demands unusual securities. Let those who are tempted by powerful and masterful allurements to (1) intemperance, (2) avarice, (3) worldliness, (4) passion, take those special measures, lay upon themselves those exceptional restraints which others do not need, but without which they themselves would be in danger of transgression.—C.

Vers. 23—25.—*The range of sin and the rule of God.* There is much uncertainty as to the intention of the Lord in this prohibition. I regard it as a lesson concerning—

I. **THE DEPTH AND BREADTH OF THE TAINT OF SIN.** The Israelites were to regard the very soil of Canaan as so polluted by the sins of its former inhabitants that the fruit which came from it must be treated "as uncircumcised" (ver. 23). Idolatry and impurity—the two flagrant sins of the Canaanites—are evils which strike deep and last long in the taint which they confer. Their consequences are penetrating and far-spreading. So, in larger or lesser degree, is all sin. It leaves a taint behind; it pollutes the mind; it mars the life; it makes its fruit, its natural growth and outcome, to be "as uncircumcised," to be unholy and unclean. And this is to an extent beyond our human estimate. If the Israelites had concluded that the iniquities of the Canaanites were to be regarded as polluting the very soil, they would not have reckoned that three years would be required to free the land from the taint of evil. But God made the purifying process extend over this protracted time. He knows that the stain of sin goes deeper and lasts longer than we think it does. What an argument this for expelling the idolatrous and unclean from our heart and life, for cultivating and cherishing the holy and the pure!

II. **THE RANGE OF GOD'S CLAIMS.** (Ver. 24.) Jehovah claimed the firstfruits of the land when the soil was cleansed: "all the fruit thereof shall be holy to praise the Lord." It was to be given (probably) to the priests. Thus God reasserted and confirmed his claim to all the produce of the land. This law would remind them that the whole soil was

his, and that he had sovereign right to dispose of it as he willed, everything being of him and belonging to him. God claims all as his; and his claim is righteous. For we *have* nothing but that which we have received from him; we *are* nothing but that which he has created and preserved. "All our springs are in him," and all that we hold and occupy is his property. When we forget our derivation from him and our dependence upon him, he reminds us, by some providential privation, that we are falling from the spirit of reverence, gratitude, and submission which is the very life of our soul. And it is well for us voluntarily to set aside to his service the firstfruits of our labour, that we may be thus powerfully and practically reminded that we owe our very being and our whole substance to his bounty and his grace.

III. THE BENEFICENCE OF THE DIVINE RULE. By this provision God sought, as he is ever seeking, (1) spiritual well-being and (2) temporal prosperity. By teaching them the truths which this abstinence suggested, and by requiring of them the patient waiting and the childlike obedience involved in the fulfilment of his will, he was disciplining and perfecting their spiritual nature. By giving them leave to pluck and partake for themselves after the fourth year, he provided for their bodily wants and appetites. These two ends God has continually in view in all his providential dealing with ourselves. He seeks our present satisfaction, and also—and far more—our spiritual well-being; our *pleasure* as children of time and sense, and our *perfection* as children of the Father of spirits, as followers of the righteous Leader, as temples of the Holy Ghost.—C.

Ver. 30.—*Three helps to spiritual progress.* "There are many adversaries," it is true; many drawbacks, hindrances, difficulties in the way of spiritual advancement. But there are these three powerful aids.

I. ONE SACRED DAY IN EVERY SEVEN. "Ye shall keep my sabbaths." God has wrested from an exacting, rapacious world one-seventh of human life, and given it to us for the culture of the soul, for spiritual growth, for sacred usefulness. The observance of the sabbath is an act of (1) filial obedience to God, and (2) wise regard for our own true welfare.

II. A PLACE FOR SOCIAL WORSHIP. "Ye shall reverence my sanctuary." We have all the advantage of social influences, the impulse which comes from association, to impress, to direct, to establish the soul in heavenly wisdom. We should worship regularly at the sanctuary, because (1) we should not draw so near to God elsewhere, or gain in any other place such spiritual nourishment; (2) worship there helps to devotion everywhere.

III. DEVOTEDNESS OF HEART TO A DIVINE BEING. "I am the Lord." Not the ineffectual endeavour to fill and feed, to nourish and strengthen the soul with admirable abstractions; but holy thought and sanctifying feeling gathered round a *Divine One*: directed toward him who says, "Trust me, love me, follow me, exalt me."—C.

*Social morality.* Ch. xix.; cf. Matt. xxii. 35-40; Rom. xii.; Jas., *passim*. From the primary principle of *unworldliness*, we now have to proceed to sundry details about social morality. Although these details are given indiscriminately, it is yet possible to discern certain great principles among them. And—

I. ALL SOCIAL MORALITY IS MADE TO REST ON OUR RELATION TO GOD HIMSELF. In the Decalogue we have social morality, that is, our duty to man, based upon our duty to God; the "second table" rests upon the first. It is the same here. God brooks no rival (ver. 4). He sets himself as our model of holiness (ver. 2). He calls man to fellowship through the peace offering (vera. 5-8). His Name must be subjected to no profanation (ver. 12), and the sabbaths are to be strictly kept (ver. 30). In other words, we have the four commandments of the first table strewn up and down these details, and exhibiting the fountain-head of social morality in faithfulness to God.

It is significant that all the efforts to make out an "independent morality" by the elimination or ignoring of God are proving failures. He is, after all, the *sine quâ non* of real morality as well as of salvation. It is when his Name is feared and reverenced as it ought to be that man acts aright in his various relations.

II. COMPASSION FOR THE POOR AND AFFLICTED, RESULTS, OF NECESSITY, FROM A DUE REGARD FOR GOD. For God is compassionate, and so should his people be. Hence the

exhortation of vers. 9, 10, about leaving in harvest-time what would be a help to the poor and the stranger. This is grounded upon the great fact, "I am the Lord your God." Hence also the warning not to curse the deaf, nor to put a stumbling-block in the way of the blind, but "thou shalt fear thy God" (ver. 14). This consideration for the afflicted and for the poor is a most important element in social morality. Our asylums for the deaf, the dumb, and the blind are embodiments of this great social duty. The poor-law system, if a little more Christian sympathy were engrafted upon it, is a noble tribute to a sense of national obligation towards the poor. Better organizations even than these will yet be the fruit of the religious spirit. How to apply the principle that "he that will not work shall not eat," and at the same time show the due measure of compassion, is a problem demanding most careful solution.

**III. MERCANTILE MORALITY IS STRICTLY ENJOINED.** All stealing, lying, and dishonest dealing is denounced (ver. 11). No advantage is to be taken of a neighbour or of a servant (ver. 13). All arbitration is to be without respect of persons (ver. 15). Weights, measures, and balances are all to be just and true (vers. 35, 36). This branch of social morality requires the strictest attention from the Lord's people. It is here that continual contact goes on between them and the world. If religion, therefore, do not produce a higher type of mercantile morality than the world, it will be discredited. Nothing injures religion so much as the mercantile immoralities of its professors. Fraudulent bankrupts, dishonest tradings, overreachings,—these are what go to lessen the influence of religion among men. It is just possible that we may, in our eagerness to be always presenting the truth of the gospel to our fellow-men, have failed to enforce sufficiently the morality which must be the great evidence of our religious life. At present, in this peculiarly mercantile age, this department of morality needs most earnest attention.

**IV. PURITY IS TO BE CULTIVATED IN ALL SOCIAL RELATIONS.** Not only was immorality discountenanced (ver. 29), and punishment and trespass offerings directed in cases where immorality had occurred (vers. 20—22), but the very cultivation of the land, the rearing of cattle, the making of garments, and, in a word, all their associations were to be pervaded by the principle of purity (vers. 19, 23—25). For the use made of cattle, and of seed, and of raw material, might be prejudicial to purity in idea. Thus carefully does the Lord fence round his people with precautions.

**V. SUPERSTITION IS TO BE DISCOURAGED.** No enchantment was to be used, nor were they to round the corners of their heads or beards; they were to make no cuttings in their flesh for the dead, or print marks upon themselves (vers. 26—28). Nor were they to have recourse to familiar spirits or wizards, to be defiled by them (ver. 31). God treats his people as intelligent, rational beings; and so he discourages all resort to unmeaning and pretended inspirations.

**VI. IT IS CLEARLY SHOWN THAT LOVE IS THE ESSENCE OF ALL SOCIAL MORALITY.** Vengeance is discouraged (ver. 18)—it is the outcome of hatred, which is unlawful when borne towards a brother (ver. 17). The form of blood-feud (ver. 16), which existed and exists among the Oriental and wandering tribes, is denounced. In fact, the Law is brought to this simple issue, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself" (ver. 18). It is upon this that our blessed Lord seized as the essence of the Divine Law (Matt. xxii. 35—40). Paul also brings this out clearly and emphatically (Rom. xiii. 9, 10). And this suggests—

1. *That there is a legitimate self-love.* There is a "better self" which it is our duty to love and cherish, just as there is a "worse self" which it is our duty to detest and mortify. When we consider this "better self," we do not suffer sin upon it, we try to keep it pure and subject unto Christ. We try to be faithful with ourselves. We foster what is good and holy within us. All this is most distinct from selfishness. The selfish man is his own worst enemy; the man who cultivates proper self-love is his own best friend.

2. *This self-love is to measure our love to our neighbour.* Now, our Lord brought out, by the parable of the "Good Samaritan," who is our neighbour. Every one to whom our heart leads us to be neighbourly. Neighbourhood is a matter of the heart. We must cultivate it. We shall have no difficulty in discerning the objects of our love. Let us then love them as we do ourselves. The golden rule is the essence of the Divine Law. "Do unto others as ye would that they should do unto you."

It is evident from this that Judaism was not intended to be an exclusive and selfish system, so far as outsiders were concerned. Men did not work it out properly, and this was why it became so narrow and selfish.—R. M. E.

Vers. 1—8.—*Purity in worship.* The laws set out in this chapter were before communicated to Aaron and his sons; now they are given to the people (vers. 1, 2). It is the privilege and duty of God's people to acquaint themselves with his will. They should learn the Law from the lips of Moses. They should learn the gospel from the lips of Jesus. It is a maxim of antichrist that "Ignorance is the mother of devotion." The mother of devotion, viz. to superstition, it is (see 1 John ii. 20, 21).

1. THE PEOPLE OF THE HOLY GOD MUST BE HOLY. (Ver. 2.) 1. *They must be separate from sinners.* (1) The people of God are distinguished by purity of heart. Of this God alone can take full cognizance. (2) Also by purity of life (Titus ii. 14). This is witnessed both by God and man. 2. *They must be separated to God.* (1) This is implied in the reason, viz. "for I am holy" (see Pet. i. 15, 16). Our Lord puts it strongly: "Be ye perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect" (Matt. v. 48). This cannot be understood *absolutely*. It must be interpreted *relatively*, viz. that as in his relations to us God is perfect, so are we to be perfect in our corresponding relations to him. But what are these? (2) As his servants. (a) We have our work assigned by his appointment. (b) He pays us our wages. In this life. In that to come. (3) As his children. (a) We have assurance of our adoption (Rom. viii. 16; Gal. iv. 6). (b) Consequently also concerning our heirship (Rom. viii. 17; Gal. iv. 7). (c) We have also blissful fellowship (John xvii. 21; 1 Cor. i. 9; 1 John i. 3, 7). 3. *Grace makes us to differ.* (1) This was ceremonially described in the Law. In order to partake of the holy things, the people must be made ceremonially holy by ablutions. (2) The truth of this is seen in the promise of the gospel. Before we can have spiritual communion with God we must be sanctified at the laver of regeneration, viz. by the renewing of the Holy Ghost.

II. THEIR HOLINESS WILL BE EXPRESSED IN PURE WORSHIP. 1. *They keep the sabbaths of the Lord.* (1) They cease from the toil of the world. So far the observance is outward. They also rest from the labour of sorrow and sin. This is an inward and spiritual observance. (2) They appear in the convocations of God's people. This worship may be public without any corresponding beauties of spiritual holiness. But the true worshipper mingles with the spiritual and heavenly portions of the Church as well as with the visible congregation (see Eph. iii. 15; Heb. xii. 22—24). (3) Parents are held responsible for instructing their children in the due observance of the sabbath. So in the fourth commandment in the Decalogue, "Thou, and thy son, and thy daughter." (4) Hence in the text (ver. 3), the injunction to keep God's sabbaths is associated with another touching the respect due from children to parents (comp. Exod. xx. 8—12). Parents are God's representatives to their children. (a) In their paternity. (b) In the providence they exercise during the helplessness and dependence of infancy and youth. (c) In their authority. This is from God, and it should be religiously maintained. Those who are allowed to break God's sabbaths will disobey their parents. 2. *They keep themselves from idols.* (1) They will not "turn" to them. We are so surrounded by them, that we cannot turn from the true worship without encountering them. (2) They will not "make" to themselves "molten gods." The allusion here is to Aaron's calf, which he intended to represent Jehovah Elohim. But in our godly parents, the work of God's hands, we have truer representations of the living Father than can possibly proceed from our own hands. (3) Idolatry is folly. Idols are *nothings* (כַּלְבָּשׂ; comp. 1 Cor. viii. 4). 3. *They serve God with reverence.* (1) They fear God, but not as slaves. They offer peace offerings to him which are offerings of friendship. They offer these also "at their own free will" (ver. 5). A constrained is an imperfect service. "God loveth a cheerful giver." (2) They worship him in faith. They will eat the peace offering the same day on which it is offered. They recognize the privileges of an early communion. What remains over on the second day they will eat. The dispensations of the types are two, viz. the patriarchal and Mosaic. But if any remain to the third day, this they burn with fire. Thus they express their faith in the Christian dispensation which should abolish the types by fulfilling them, and which should bring in better hopes.

(3) To return to the legal dispensation is now to provoke the anger of the Lord. Cyril of Alexandria argues that those who fail to see any spiritual meaning in the Law are still bound to keep it in the letter. But even that could do them no good, for according to the text, "If it be eaten at all on the third day, it is abominable; it shall not be accepted. Therefore every one that eateth it shall bear his iniquity," etc. (vers. 7, 8). To rejecters of the gospel now there is nothing but hopeless excision.—J. A. M.

Vers. 9—14.—*Kindliness.* In the earlier portion of this chapter purity of worship, with its associated reverence for the authority of God, in his representatives, viz. natural parents, and his institutions, as the sabbath, are enjoined. In the verses following our duties towards our fellows come more prominently before us, and in the text that class of those duties whose spirit is kindliness. Charity is sister to piety. We have here enjoined—

I. A GENEROUS CONSIDERATION FOR THE POOR. 1. *The needs of the gleaner are to be respected.* (1) In reaping the harvest, owners are instructed to spare the corners of their crops for the poor. What falls from the hand of the reaper is not to be gathered up again, but left to the gleaner. So in gleaning the vintage, the loose branches must be left to the poor and the stranger. (2) We must not consider that to be wasted which goes to the poor. (3) The harvest and vintage are seasons of joy. Such seasons should be seasons also of charity. Kindliness purifies and so heightens joy. 2. *The authority of God must be remembered.* (1) "I am Jehovah thy Elohim." This gives the poor and the stranger a Divine right in the gleanings, which now to disregard becomes inpiety and injustice. Those who refuse their rights to the poor will have to answer for it to God (Ps. ix. 18; xii. 5; lxxxii.; Isa. x. 1—4). (2) The Divine example should inspire and guide us. "He openeth his hand, and satisfieth every living thing." Man must not attempt to close the hand of God by refusing to the poor their due. (3) The blessing of God is promised to those who consider the poor (see Deut. xxiv. 19; Ps. xli. 1; Prov. xiv. 21).

II. A CAREFUL AVOIDANCE OF INJUSTICE. 1. *Wrong must not be practised stealthily.* (1) "Ye shall not steal"—ye shall not injure your neighbour in a concealed way. To reap the harvest too narrowly would be to filch from the poor his due. (2) "Neither shall ye deal falsely." Thus there must be no concealing of faults in articles offered for sale. There must be no false representation of values either in vending or purchasing. 2. *Lies must not be uttered.* (1) "Neither lie one to another." When a lie is *acted* in false dealing, the next thing is to *utter* a lie to cover the wrong. One falsehood calls up another to keep it in countenance. (2) "And ye shall not swear by my Name falsely." Upon the principle that lies are called in to countenance the concealment of a wrong, oaths are suborned to countenance lies. Thus sin begets sin; and sin, in its offspring, becomes increasingly degenerate. (3) This last is frightful wickedness. "Neither shalt thou profane the Name of thy God." It is appealing to the God of truth to confirm a lie! 3. *Nor must wrong be openly perpetrated.* (1) "Thou shalt not defraud thy neighbour, neither rob him." Power must not be abused in oppression. Many of the forms in which this was done are described by Job (ch. xxiv.). (2) "The wages of him that is hired shall not abide with thee all night until the morning." It is the means of his living; and once earned, no more belongs to the employer than does the property of any other person. Huge injustice is practised by those who take long credit from tradesmen, who thereby are put to the utmost straits to meet their business claims and those of their families.

III. A TENDER RESPECT FOR THE CONDITION OF THE AFFLICTED. 1. *"Thou shalt not curse the deaf."* (1) Thou shalt not be enraged should a deaf man be unable to render the service of one who has his hearing. So it is unreasonable to blame for not having rendered service those who were not informed that such service was expected. (2) Thou shalt not curse, in his presence, a man that is deaf, because he is deaf and cannot hear it. So neither in his absence must a man be cursed, who is in the same case with the deaf, and cannot defend himself. 2. *"Nor put a stumblingblock before the blind."* (1) To do this literally would be a wanton cruelty. (2) Traps must not be laid for the unwary to their hurt, viz. in things material or in things spiritual (see Rom. xiv. 13). 3. *"But thou shalt fear thy God."* (1) Afflictions do not spring from

the dust. They come from God or are permitted by him. To take advantage of them or to trifl with them is therefore to tempt the Lord. (2) The fear of the retributive justice of Heaven should restrain (see Luke xvii. 1). Biblical history abundantly proves that the law of retaliation is a law of God.—J. A. M.

Vers. 15—18.—*Justice.* As charity is sister to piety, so is justice related to both. This virtue is enjoined upon us—

I. IN RESPECT TO CONDUCT. 1. *In judgment justice should be impartial.* (1) Pity for the poor is, in the abstract, good. Yet must it not lead us to favour them against the right (Exod. xxiii. 3). (2) Respect for those who enjoy rank and station is not only lawful but laudable. But this must not lead us to favour them in judgment (see Jas. ii. 1—4). (3) The balances of justice are those of the sanctuary. They are true. They must be held by an impartial hand. It must not tremble under the excitement of pity, or of hope, or fear. 2. *In dealings justice should be strict.* (1) "Thou shalt not go up and down as a talebearer among thy people." Pedlaring is the vice here interdicted. This is rather the meaning of the word (*לְכַנּוֹת*) rendered "talebearer." Tramps, who have no settled residence, are oftentimes dishonest, and otherwise so dangerous to society, that every nation has its vagrant acts to control them. (2) The Jews in their dispersion are much given to pedlaring. It has been to them a necessity owing to the unfriendly laws of the nations with respect to them. How dreadfully their sin has been visited upon their head when their necessities urge them to violate their law! (3) Pedlars have, amongst other evils, been notorious *tale-bearers*. By the slanders they have circulated not only has the peace of families been invaded, but communities and nations have been embroiled. The Jews say, "One evil tongue hurts three persons—the speaker, the hearer, and the person spoken of" (see Prov. xi. 13; xx. 19). 3. *The evils of injustice are serious.* (1) "Neither shalt thou stand against the blood of thy neighbour." Some are wicked enough of purpose to compass the blood of the innocent by falsehood (Prov. ii. 11, 12; Ezek. xxii. 9). (2) Slander may have this result without the intention of the slanderer. Who can control a conflagration? (see Jas. iii. 6)

II. IN RESPECT TO MOTIVE. 1. "*Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thine heart.*" (1) He is thy brother. He has a common fatherhood with thee in God. He has a common nature with thee. (2) He is therefore amenable with thee to the same tribunal, God, the Judge of all, surveys not the conduct only, but also the motive. 2. "*Thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbour.*" (1) Not to reprove his sin is to hate him. This is eminently so when he hath trespassed against thee. To conceal it in such a case is to nurse wrath against the opportunity for revenge (2 Sam. xiii. 22). Such conduct is utterly at variance with the spirit of the gospel (see Matt. xviii. 15; Luke xvii. 3). (2) To "suffer sin upon him" is to be an accomplice in his sin. The words may be construed, "nor bear his sin." This suggests that the accomplice, with the guilt, is also obnoxious to the punishment of the sinner. Men wreak their vengeance upon themselves. (3) In rebuking we should remember that the sinner is our "neighbour." It should be done in a neighbourly way. Thus, as far as practicable, privately. "Charity covereth a multitude of sins," viz. from others, though not from the sinner. And kindly. It is thus more likely to be well received, as it ought to be (see Ps. cxli. 5; Prov. xxvii. 5, 6). 3. *The root of justice is love.* (1) "Thou shalt not avenge." This is another way of saying, "Thou shalt forgive." With the spirit of vengeance there can be no peace in the world. God says, "Vengeance is mine;" he claims the right to avenge because he alone is superior to all retaliation. (2) "Nor bear any grudge." Thou shalt not *insidiously* watch the children of thy people. How the Jews violated this law in their malignity against Jesus! (see Mark iii. 2; Luke vi. 7; xiv. 1; xx. 2). (3) Contrariwise, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." This is the spirit of the Law as well as of the gospel. The same Holy Spirit of love is the author of both (see Matt. vii. 12; xxii. 39; Rom. xiii. 9, 10; 1 Cor. ix. 19; Gal. v. 14).—J. A. M.

Vers. 19—28.—*Fidelity to God.* In the verses before us we note the injunction—

I. THAT THE STATUTES OF THE LORD MUST BE KEPT. These require: 1. *That there be no unnatural mixtures.* (1) For the examples furnished, sound economic and hygienic reasons may be given (ver. 19). (a) Cattle which God ordered "after their kind" (Gen. i. 25), are not to be let to gender with diverse kinds. Hybrids are degene-

rated creatures; they are monsters; and they are withal unfruitful. (b) Mingled seed must not be sown in the field. The plants of both kinds in such a case are found to be inferior (Deut. xxii, 9). The land also is impoverished. (c) Garments of mingled flax and wool are not to be worn. The mixture would induce electrical disturbances impairing to health. (2) But the spirit of the law is *moral*. The people of God are taught by it to avoid everything that would compromise their simplicity and sincerity (2 Cor. vi. 14). They must avoid marriages with the ungodly. In business they must be careful not to join in ungodly partnerships. In friendships they must choose those who are of the household of faith (Jas. iv. 4). 2. *That atonement be made for sin.* (1) The case (ver. 20) is that of a slave dishonoured and still held in bondage, who, through a subsequent offence, which, if she were free, would merit death (see Deut. xxii. 24), is now punished with scourging. The degree of guilt is modified by circumstances; and punishment is moderated accordingly (Luke xii. 47, 48). (2) But before the man can be forgiven he must confess his sin over a guilt offering. He must bring a ram. This was a well-known type of Christ, without whose atonement, no matter what scourging our sin may have brought upon us, there can be no forgiveness. 3. *That the fruit of a tree uncircumcised must not be eaten.* (1) For this law there are good economic reasons. It hurts a young tree to let the fruit ripen upon it; and therefore to circumcise it, or pinch off the blossoms of the first three years, will improve the quality of its fruit. In the fourth year, then, the fruit will be in perfection. (2) But the spirit of this law also is *moral*. (a) Trees are taken as emblems of men (Ps. i. 3; Matt. iii. 10; Isa. lxi. 3; Jude 12). (b) First thoughts and *forward* desires are vanity, and must be rejected as coming from the flesh (see Col. ii. 11). To let them ripen is to injure the character. (c) In the fourth year, when the fruit is in perfection, it is consecrated to God as the "firstfruit," which therefore is *not* always that which comes *first* in order of time, but the *best*. The service we render to God after the removal of inordinate desire by converting grace, is our firstfruit, or best service. (d) As to the *fourth* year, Christ who is the "Firstfruit" and "Firstborn of every creature," or *Antitype* of the firstborn of every kind of creature, appeared amongst us in the *fourth* millennium of the world. And when he comes again it will be to introduce the *fourth* dispensation, *viz.* the millennial. The three dispensations preceding we need scarcely specify to be the Patriarchal, Levitical, and Christian. (e) In the fifth year and thence-forward, the fruit was sanctified to the use of the owner. The consummation of our felicity will be in that glorious state to succeed the millennium, the "new heavens and new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness." We note—

II. **THAT THE CUSTOMS OF THE HEATHEN MUST NOT BE FOLLOWED.** 1. *Nothing must be eaten with the blood.* (1) At the time when animal food was granted to man the blood was reserved. The reservation corresponded to that of the tree of knowledge of good and evil when vegetable food was granted. In each instance the prohibition was given to common progenitors of the race, and therefore universally obligatory. Noah stood to the "world that now is" in a similar relation to that in which Adam stood to mankind at large. (2) The Noachian precepts in general were violated by the heathen, and in particular this precept respecting blood. The psalmist refers to the custom amongst the Syrians when he says, "Their drink offerings of blood will I not offer" (Ps. xvi. 4). And in these words there is a prophetic abhorrence of antichrist, who not only sets aside the Law of God by authorizing the eating of blood, but professes to drink the very blood of Jesus in the cup of the Mass. (3) The penalties of this abomination are tremendous. As in Eden the eating of the forbidden fruit became death, so in the Noachian precept God requires the blood of the lives of those who will eat flesh with the life thereof which is the blood (Gen. ix. 4, 5). Babylon who is also "drunk with the blood of the saints and martyrs of Jesus," is therefore doomed to drink blood, for that she is worthy (Rev. xvii. 6; xvi. 3-6). 2. *Superstition must be shunned.* (1) Thus augury is to be discouraged (ver. 26). This (*em*) *nachash*, or divining, may have been by *fire* or *serpents*. "Nor observe times," nor consult the clouds. The heavens were their gods, and the clouds they naturally regarded as their aspects toward men, as indicating their intentions. The revealed word of the true God is sufficient for all lawful purposes of sacred knowledge. (2) Distractions for the dead are to be discouraged. The heathen customs of cutting the hair and the flesh evinced the insanity of idolatry. Where the faith of a true religion is we have no need to mourn for the dead as those who have no hope.—J. A. M.

Vers. 29—37.—*The fear of God.* Of this excellent things are spoken by Solomon. It is the “beginning of knowledge,” “hatred to evil,” “strong confidence,” a “fountain of life,” “prolongs days,” and “gives riches and honour.” So here—

I. **IT IS A SOURCE OF PURITY.** 1. *To the family.* (1) There is a connection between vers. 29 and 30. Those who keep God’s sabbaths will not profane their daughters either to idolatry or for gain. The fear of God nourished by the one will prevent the other. (2) In keeping God’s sabbaths his sanctuary is reverenced. This furnishes an additional motive to social purity. For the sanctuary, whether it be composed of canvas, or of stone, or of flesh and blood, is the temple of the Holy Ghost. Who then can properly reverence it under one form and desecrate it under another? (see 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17; vi. 18, 19; 2 Cor. vi. 16) 2. *To the nation.* “Lest the land,” etc. (ver. 29). (1) The family is the root of the nation. All nations extant are sprung from the family of Noah. (2) Nations are blessed or cursed in their families. (3) God asserts himself here, “I am Jehovah” (ver 30). The character of God is seen in his laws. It is pledged to maintain them.

II. **IT ARMS AGAINST THE POWER OF DEVILS.** 1. *Familiar spirits are more than myths.* (1) Their existence is not here challenged, but admitted (ver. 31; see also Acts xvi. 18, where the fact is put beyond question). (2) Pretenders to the unenviable distinction, as well as persons actually possessed of such devils, are here held up to reprobation. 2. *The fear of the Lord will preserve us from them.* (1) Their power is greatest over the “children of disobedience.” The desperately wicked are given over by God to Satan (Eph. ii. 2; 1 Tim. i. 20). Such persons may seek wizards, or wise ones. (2) But godly persons will avoid them. They could not so reflect upon the wisdom and goodness of God that he should leave anything for our advantage to be communicated by wicked spirits. Spiritualism is a devilish delusion. Pride and selfishness will lead men into the snare. (3) In this prohibition God asserts himself, “I am Jehovah thy Elohim.” He is our covenant Friend, who will so fully satisfy our lawful desires that we shall not need recourse to wicked expedients. He will also be our defence against the devices of the devil.

III. **IT INSPIRES COURTESY.** 1. *Respect for age* (ver. 32). (1) With age there should be the wisdom of experience, and this should be honoured by youth. Caryl well says, “He that wears the *silver crown* should be honoured in his capacity as well as he that wears the *golden crown*.” (2) In respecting age we are to “fear Jehovah Elohim,” our covenant God, whose blessings are from father to son and from generation to generation (Gen. xvii. 7; Isa. li. 8; Luke i. 50). In the aged man we should see the representative of the “Ancient of days” (Dan. vii. 22). (3) It is a sad sign of the degeneracy of a nation when the child behaves himself proudly against the ancient (Job xxx. 1, 12; Isa. iii. 4, 5). 2. *Civility to strangers.* (1) “Thou shalt not vex,” or oppress, “him;” but treat him as though he were a native. “Thou shalt love him as thyself.” How tradition obscured this law when the question was prompted, viz. “Who is my neighbour?” (2) The Hebrew is reminded, in connection with this injunction, how bitterly he suffered in the land of Egypt from the operation of the opposite principle. He is also reminded how odious to God was that cruel oppression from which he brought him out, and therefore how, if he would conciliate his favour, he must act from a different principle.

IV. **IT PROMOTES JUSTICE.** 1. *In judgment.* (1) In the administration of law. (2) In arbitration. 2. *In dealings.* (1) Measures and weights must be true to the standards. These were kept in the tabernacle, and afterwards in the temple (ch. xxvii. 25; 1 Chron. xxiii. 29). Religion and business must not be divorced. (2) To use false balances, or weights, or measures is worse than open robbery. It is abominable hypocrisy. It is robbing under the very colour of equity.

God claims the authorship of these laws (vers. 36, 37). 1. They are worthy of him. He must be infatuated with ignorance or wickedness who would laud the “Roman virtue” in opposition to the “narrow spirit” of the Mosaic code. 2. They were eminently calculated to secure the happiness of the nation at home, and to promote its credit abroad. 3. Let us “observe” the Law of God to understand it, and, understanding, “keep” it. Then happy shall we be.—J. A. M.

Vers. 1, 2.—“*Ye shall be holy: for I the Lord your God am holy.*” *Holiness.*

I. THE UNIVERSAL REQUIREMENT. "Speak unto all the congregation," etc. 1. No exception. "All have sinned." 2. The nature of man requires him to be holy. The relation between man and God. The laws of God not mere arbitrary decrees, but the expression, in positive relation to the freedom of man, of the Eternal Reality of the universe. 3. The universality of revelation is the universality of responsibility: "Their line is gone out in all the earth." "Having not the Law, they are a law unto themselves." What was said to the Jews was said to the world. The blessedness of humanity is the realization of the Divine image. A holy God, a holy universe.

II. THE UNIVERSAL MOTIVE. "For I am holy." 1. *Dependence* upon God, the root of religion, not as mere blind dependence, but that of the children on the Father. 2. *Gratitude* the constant appeal of the heart. The Lord your God, who has done so much for you, requires your holiness. 3. The Divine command is related to and blessed with the *Divine provision of grace* in a specific system of holiness, in which the people of God are held up. Be holy, for I have prepared for your holiness. We are "created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them" (Eph. ii. 10). Work out salvation, for God worketh in you.

III. THE MEDIATING MINISTRY. "The Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto all the congregation." 1. Here is the *gracious method* by which our holiness is made possible. The *holy God* speaks. The *holy men of God* speak as they are moved by the *Holy Ghost*. The *holy Word* speaks, everywhere and always. The *holy life* is maintained among the *holy people*. 2. The holiness of humanity will be achieved as a fact through a *holy ministry* of the people of God to the world at large; of the consecrated few to the many. The hope of a revived *Church*, in a revived *ministry*. The spiritual leaders should feel their responsibility, both in teaching and in example. 3. *Personal holiness* must underlie all other. The purification of temples and services is not the sanctification God requires. He says not, "Be ye punctilious in worship and profuse in ritual;" but "Be ye personally holy, let your holiness be a transcript of mine, which is the holiness of will, of work, of thought, of character.—R.

Vers. 3—37.—*The holy Law in the holy life.* I. REVERENCE FOR PARENTS. True religion is seen in common, everyday life. If we love God, we love man. Family peace and order is best preserved by appeal to deep, religious motives. Natural affection is not sufficient against fallen human nature. "God says, *Thou shalt*," must be the support of natural feeling.

II. SABBATH KEEPING. Not as a Jewish regulation, but as both the demand of physical nature and the gracious provision of God for us. "The Son of man is Lord of the sabbath;" therefore, while preserving it from abuse to the oppression of human liberty, sanctifying it for the higher place it occupies in the Christian scheme.

III. ABSOLUTE SEPARATION FROM IDOLATRY and all heathenism. Holy religion.

IV. WILLINGHOOD IN RELIGION. Ver. 5, "At your own will," or "that you may be accepted," i.e. do it as unto God, by his Word, for his glory, in dependence on his grace, with hearty resignation of self to him.

V. PHILANTHROPY AND COMPASSION FOR THE POOR. The true charity is a practical remembrance of the needy and suffering, beginning at home, from our own personal possessions. God is the Lord of all. All are brethren.

VI. HONESTY OF DEALING is only to be maintained by religion. Mere social considerations and political economy will never purify trade and sanctify men's intercourse with one another. Truth is safe in no keeping but that of the sanctuary.

VII. PROFANITY in speech and in act is an evil to be cured by positive religion.

VIII. THE JUSTICE OF THE LIFE is the justice of the heart in expression. The law that is kept sacred within will be honoured without respect of persons, and not by mere negation, but in active benevolence.

IX. REAL NEIGHBOURLINESS IS LOVE OF MAN PROCEEDING FROM LOVE OF GOD. No injury must be done either by word or deed, either by neglect of another's interests or unholy wrath against another or encouraging him to sin by withholding due rebuke. All summed up in the positive precept, "Love thy neighbour as thyself." All the various prescriptions of the Jewish law, both negative and positive, regard the pure and holy development both of individual and national life. Religion is the root, social morality is the blossom or the plant, national prosperity is the precious fruit, of which,

if we would preserve the seed and perpetuate the blessing, we must see to it that we find the very inmost centre and kernel, which is the love of God as the Father of all, and the love of men as the brethren of the same Divine family.—R.

### EXPOSITION.

#### CHAPTER XX.

The subject of ch. xviii. is resumed in this chapter; but that which was before considered as sin only is now regarded as crime, and penalties are attached according to the heinousness of the offence. For example, the sin of “giving of his seed to Molech,” or which is the same thing, “letting any of his seed pass through the fire to Molech,” had been forbidden as a sin in ch. xviii. 21; now it is condemned as a crime. The various penalties assigned in this chapter are (1) *burning with fire* (ver. 14); (2) *stoning with stones* (vers. 2, 27); (3) *being put to death* in a manner not specified (vers. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16); (4) *being cut off from among his people*, either by God himself (vers. 4, 5, 6) or by an agency not specified (vers. 17, 18); (5) *bearing his iniquity* (vers. 17, 19, 20); (6) *childlessness* (vers. 20, 21). The first of these penalties, *burning with fire*, does not mean that those on whom it was inflicted were burnt alive, but that their dead bodies were burnt after they had been stoned to death, as in the case of Achan (Josh. vii. 25). It is the punishment for taking a mother and daughter together into the same harem (ver. 14). *Stoning with stones* is appointed for crimes which are at once offences against religion and morals, viz. giving of his seed to Molech (ver. 2), and witchcraft (ver. 27). The other form of *putting to death*, which no doubt was strangling, is the penalty assigned to curding parents (ver. 9), adultery (ver. 10), marriage or intercourse with a stepmother (ver. 11) or stepdaughter (ver. 12), the sin of Sodom (ver. 13), and bestiality (vers. 15, 16). *Cutting off from his people* may be effected either by death (vera. 4, 5, and perhaps 6), which is the penalty for Molech-worship, connivance at Molech-worship, and dealing with witches; or by excommunication (vers. 17, 18), which was the punishment for intercourse with a sister, or with one who was unclean by reason of her monthly sickness (see Exod. xxxi. 14).

The phrase, *bearing his iniquity*, means that the man continues in the state of a criminal until he has been cleansed either by suffering the punishment of his offence or making atonement for it, which sometimes he might, sometimes he might not, do. The man who committed incest with a sister would “*bear his iniquity*” (ver. 17), because he would be put in a state of excommunication without permission of restoration by means of sacrificial offerings. And so with the man who took his aunt by blood (ver. 19) or by marriage (ver. 20) as his wife,—he would not be allowed to recover his status by offering sacrifice. *Childlessness*, the punishment for marrying an uncle’s or brother’s wife, probably means that in those cases the offender’s children should not be counted as his own, but should be entered in the genealogical register as his uncle’s or his brother’s children. (Cf. Deut. xxv. 10, where it is noticeable that the penalty is retained, even though the marriage with the brother’s wife, which had been prohibited in general, had in the particular case become a duty for family or tribal reasons.)

Vers. 2, 3.—The close connection between giving of his seed unto Molech and defiling my sanctuary, and profaning my holy name, is explained and illustrated by Ezekiel in the judgment on Aholah and Aholibah. “They have caused their sons, whom they bare unto me, to pass for them through the fire, to devour them. Moreover this they have done unto me: they have defiled my sanctuary in the same day, and have profaned my sabbaths. For when they had slain their children to their idols, then they came the same day into my sanctuary to profane it; and, lo, thus have they done in the midst of mine house” (Ezek. xliii. 37—39). Not only was the juxtaposition and combination of the worship of Molech and Jehovah an offence to him whose name is Jealous, but at the time that Molech-worship was carried on in the valley of Hinnom, idols were set up in the court of the temple itself, as we learn from the Book of Kings and from Jeremiah. “But they set their abominations in the house, which is called by my Name, to defile it. And they built the high places of Baal,

which are in the valley of the son of Hinnom, to cause their sons and their daughters to pass through the fire unto Molech; which I commanded them not, neither came it into my mind, that they should do this abomination, to cause Judah to sin" (Jer. xxxii. 34, 35). And of Manasseh it is related, "He built altars in the house of the Lord, of which the Lord said, In Jerusalem will I put my Name. And he built altars for all the host of heaven in the two courts of the house of the Lord. And he made his son pass through the fire" (2 Kings. xxi. 4-6).

Vers. 4, 5.—There is to be no connivance with Molech-worship. The penalty is death, and is to be carried out by the proper tribunals, whose business it was to see that the stoning took place. So in Deuteronomy the duty of killing those who entice to idolatry is laid down, "Thou shalt not consent unto him, nor hearken unto him; neither shall thine eye pity him, neither shalt thou spare, neither shalt thou conceal him: but thou shalt surely kill him; thine hand shall be first upon him to put him to death, and afterwards the hand of all the people" (Deut. xiii. 8, 9). In the case of Molech-worship God declares that, if the tribunals of the nation fail to adjudge the penalty of death to the offender, he will himself take the matter into his hands, and cut him off with his family and all that follow him in his sin of unfaithfulness.

Ver. 6.—God will also himself cut off from among his people any that, not content with lawful and godly knowledge, turn after such as have familiar spirits, and after wizards, to go a whoring after them.

Vers. 7, 8.—A positive command, *Sanctify yourselves therefore, and be ye holy: for I am the Lord your God*, is introduced early in the list of penalties to show what is the main purpose of the latter. The only way in which the nation can recover holiness lost by the sins of its members, is by the punishment of the latter, or by their purification by means of sacrifice, according to the nature of the offence.

Ver. 9.—See above, the note on ch. xix. 14, which shows how God's word is made of none effect by man's traditions. God says that a man who curseth his father or his

mother shall be surely put to death. Human authority, incontrovertible throughout a great part of Christendom, declares that in most cases it is no grave sin.

Ver. 10.—The Hebrew punishment for adultery is more severe than that of most other nations. Death is again pronounced as the penalty of both adulterer and adulteress in Deut. xxii. 22. The crime is that of a man with a married woman, whether the man be married or not; it is not that of a married man with an unmarried woman, which, in a country where polygamy was allowed, could not be regarded in the same light.

Vers. 11, 12.—It should be noted that intercourse with a stepmother or daughter-in-law are put, by the punishment inflicted upon them, on the same level with adultery and unnatural crimes (vera. 10, 13, 15, 16).

Vers. 13-19.—(See ch. xviii. 22, 17, 23, 9, 19, 12.)

Vers. 20, 21.—*They shall die childless; . . . they shall be childless.* "It cannot be supposed that a perpetual miracle was to be maintained through all the ages of Israel's history; but the meaning evidently is that the children of such marriages should be reckoned, not to their actual father, but to the former husband of the woman. In the strong feeling of the Israelites in regard to posterity, this penalty seems to have been sufficient" (Gardiner).

Vers. 22, 23.—The fact of the nations of Canaan being abhorred by God because they committed all these things shows that the Levitical code forbidding *all these things* was no part of any special law for that nation alone, but a republication of that Law which is binding on all nations because written on the conscience. The prohibited degrees in the Book of Leviticus form a part of the moral, not of the ceremonial, law, and are, therefore, of permanent and universal, not only of temporary and national, obligation.

Vers. 24-26.—The Israelites are to avoid all defilement, moral and ceremonial, because they are God's own possession, separated from other people, and holy unto him.

Ver. 27.—Those that deal in witchcraft are to be stoned.

### HOMILETICS.

Vers. 1, 21.—*The difference between the religious and the secular law* is more marked in modern nations than in the Hebrew commonwealth; the primary object of the first being to forbid and prevent sin; of the second, to protect life and property. The distinction is shown by the separation of the eighteenth and the twentieth chapters; but as in the Mosaic legislation both the law which denounces sin and the law which pronounces penalties for crime proceeded from God, it was not necessary that the boundaries between the two should be marked and defined with the same exactness

as when man is legislator; for man cannot venture to gauge the relative enormities of sins, and assign to them their respective punishments, except so far as he is led by the hand by the revelation of God. He can only judge of wrongs and injuries to his fellow-men. In the present age of the world, when the State and the Church are no longer identical, as they were in the case of the Israelites, each law fulfils its function best by confining itself to its proper sphere. The religious law, basing itself on the Divine Law, prohibits and denounces sin; the secular law, being an elaboration by the human intellect of the idea of justice in its various applications to the events of human life, condemns and punishes crimes, by which wrong is done to others.

Vers. 6, 27.—*The pursuit of knowledge by right means* is one of the highest and noblest occupations of the intellect of man, but the seeking after knowledge by unlawful means is so criminal as to lead God to cut off the presumptuous seeker from among his people. It was grasping after a forbidden knowledge by unrighteous means that brought death into the world (Gen. iii. 6). All dealing in necromancy and witchcraft involves this sin on the part of the inquirer into futurity, whether those whom they consult be merely deceivers or not.

Ver. 9.—Just as the negative law, “Thou shalt do no murder,” involves the positive law, “Thou shalt love thy neighbour,” so the law forbidding to curse a father or a mother contains within it the law of reverential submission to parents and to all in authority.

Ver. 26.—The command, “*Ye shall be holy unto me: for I the Lord am holy,*” is binding upon Christians far more strongly than on the Israelites. For—

I. CHRISTIANS HAVE A POWER GIVEN THEM WHEREBY THEY CAN BE HOLY WHICH THE ISRAELITES HAD NOT. St. Paul, having declared that the final purpose of God's election and our adoption in Christ is “that we should be holy and without blame before him in love” (Eph. i. 4), goes on to say that to those who believed, on hearing the gospel of their salvation preached, there was given the earnest of the Holy Spirit, with which they were sealed unto the day of redemption (Eph. i. 13, 14). The Spirit of holiness is given to every baptized Christian soul, in a way in which he was not imparted to the Israelites, the dispensation of types and shadows having given place to that of spiritual realities, and the promised Comforter having been sent, not only to be with us, but to be in us (John xiv. 16, 17; xvi. 7—15).

II. CHRISTIANS HAVE IN CHRIST AN EXAMPLE OF DIVINE HOLINESS WHICH THE ISRAELITES HAD NOT. They are therefore able to realize more fully than the Israelites the manner in which they are to “*be holy, for the Lord your God is holy.*” They see before them the example of One who is God, and who emptied himself of his glory and power, and was made man, and lived a life of perfect holiness on earth. On this model they can, by the help of that Spirit vouchsafed to each Christian, form their own lives. It is an ideal never to be attained, but yet to have an ideal is an inexpressible help.

III. CHRISTIANS, BY THEIR UNION WITH CHRIST AS THEIR HEAD, RECEIVE FROM HIM OF HIS HOLINESS. God has given Christ “to be the Head over all things to the Church, which is his body” (Eph. i. 22, 23), and has gathered “together in one all things in Christ” (Eph. i. 10), that we “may grow up into him in all things, which is the Head, even Christ: from whom the whole body . . . maketh increase . . . unto the edifying of itself in love” (Eph. iv. 15, 16). “Christ is the Head of the Church, as the husband is head of the wife” (Eph. v. 23), and “we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones” (Eph. v. 30). The Word is “full of grace and truth . . . and of his fulness have all we received, and grace for grace” (John i. 14—16). From the mystical union between Christ and his Church there flow down graces upon those who are the members of his Church.

IV. CHRISTIANS CAN BY FAITH APPROPRIATE TO THEMSELVES OF THE HOLINESS OF CHRIST. By faith the holiness, whereby satisfaction was made by Christ for the sinfulness of all mankind, may be so realized by the believing Christian as to be regarded as though it were his own in respect to his own sins.

## HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

*Human sacrifices.* Ch. xx. 1-5; cf. Gen. xxii. 1-19; Micah vi. 7. In this chapter we come to a catalogue of *capital crimes*. Upon the whole list of cases we need not dwell; but the first has some interest as raising the question of "human sacrifices." How early the terrible practice of offering "the fruit of the body" in atonement for "the sin of the soul" arose, we can scarcely say. It has been supposed to be as early, at all events, as the time of Abraham. Some entertain the notion that the sacrifice of Isaac was primarily a temptation to imitate the custom existing in the land. But if the horrible custom existed in Abraham's day, nothing could more clearly convey that the Divine pleasure rested in other sacrifices altogether than the details of the escape of Isaac. The custom of human sacrifices was widespread, as investigations show.<sup>1</sup> Here and elsewhere the Lord sets his face against them. Let us see if we can grasp the principle involved.

I. HUMAN SACRIFICE IS THE NATURAL CLIMAX OF THE SACRIFICIAL IDEA. "If no scruples," says Ewald, "held a man back from giving the dearest he had when a feeling in his heart drove him to sacrifice it to his God just as it was, then he would easily feel even the life of a beloved domestic animal not too dear to be given up at his heart's urgent demand. Nay, only in the offering up of life or soul, as the last that can be offered, did it seem to him that the highest was presented. But the logical consequence of such feelings was that human life must ultimately be looked upon as incomparably the highest and most wondrous offering, whether the life offered be that of a stranger or, as that which is dearest to one, that of one's own child, or even of one's self. Thus human sacrifice was everywhere the proper crown and completion of all these utterances of the fear of God." The case of Abraham is one in point. When God for wise purposes demanded the surrender of the only begotten and well-beloved son, Isaac, he asked the patriarch for the greatest conceivable sacrifice; and, so far as intention is concerned, Abraham made the surrender. It has been called on the patriarch's part a "magnificent and extraordinary act of romantic morals."<sup>2</sup> While, therefore, it was in reality, as we shall see, a condemnation of human sacrifices as such, it illustrates their real spirit.

II. HUMAN SACRIFICE IS AT THE SAME TIME SUCH A MONSTROUS AND EXTRAVAGANT EXPRESSION OF THE SACRIFICIAL IDEA THAT NOTHING BUT A DIVINE COMMAND WOULD WARRANT THE ENTERTAINMENT OF IT. What distinguishes Abraham's case in connection with the proposed sacrifice of Isaac from that of all other sacrifices of human life is that he had a command of God to go upon, while the others followed the devices of their own hearts. So sacred should human life appear to men, that the idea of taking it away should only be entertained under the most solemn sanctions. Besides, but for the sin-distorted mind of man, it would appear that the consecration of human beings as "living sacrifices," is in itself far higher and nobler than their death (Rom. xii. 1). To take innocent infants and place them in the flaming arms of Molech must appear a most monstrous and exaggerated expression of the sacrificial idea.

But would God, in any circumstances, command human sacrifices? As a matter of fact, men were sacrificed through capital punishment. The present chapter is full of capital crimes. Men died under the direction of God for their crimes. This, however, is not the sacrificial idea, which involves the sacrifice of the *innocent* in the room of the guilty. This was doubtless what led the infants to be favourite sacrifices with the heathen—the innocence of the sufferer constituted the greater appeal to the angry deity. We observe, then—

III. THAT GOD FORBADE, UNDER THE PENALTY OF DEATH, HUMAN SACRIFICES, AND IN THE ONLY CASE WHERE HE SEEMED TO DEMAND A HUMAN SACRIFICE HE HAD PROVIDED A SUBSTITUTE. He made the offering of children to Molech a capital crime. This was not aimed at the idolatry only, but at the unwarranted exaggeration of the sacrificial idea. Besides, in the case of Isaac, just when Abraham was about to slay

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible," s.v. "Molech;" also Ewald's references, note p. 69, of his "Antiquities of Israel."

<sup>2</sup> Mozley's "Ruling Ideas in Early Ages," p. 62; see also the chapter on "Human Sacrifices."

him, God interposed with a provided substitute. All God required in Abraham's peculiar case was the *spirit* of surrender. He guards, therefore, his prerogative of dealing with life, and enjoins his people only to take human life away when he directs them. They are not to presume to offer such a sacred gift as human life upon his altar in the way of sacrifice. They may dedicate themselves and their children as living beings to his service, but their death he requires not in such a voluntary fashion at their hands.

IV. AT THE SAME TIME, WE FIND HUMAN LIFE REGULARLY SACRIFICED IN THE ORDER OF DIVINE PROVIDENCE AND AT THE CALL OF DUTY. That is to say, though we have not monstrous and unhallowed sacrifices required of God at his altars, he does make demands on men and women to surrender, like Abraham, their sons, or to surrender themselves at the call of duty. This is indeed as real a sacrifice as in the arms of Molech, and at the same time a far nobler one. In fact, *self-sacrifice* seems to be a law of providence in the case of all who would be truly noble in their careers. The voluntary element, coming in along with the sweet reasonableness of the sublime necessity, vindicates the morality of the whole transaction. Men and women cheerfully lay down their lives in gradual sacrifice to duty's call, or sometimes in sudden and immediate sacrifice. And the act is moral as well as heroic.

V. THIS LEADS TO A LAST OBSERVATION, THAT HUMAN SACRIFICE HAD ITS GREAT CULMINATION AND CLIMAX IN THAT OF JESUS CHRIST. For what God did not require from Abraham—the actual sacrifice of his son—he has required of himself. The demand for a human sacrifice made only apparently in the case of Isaac, was made really in the case of Christ. An innocent, sinless human being was once commanded by his God and Father to lay down his life and bear, in doing so, the sins of man. Hence we find him saying, "Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I might take it again" (John x. 17). It would seem a harsh command, a cruel necessity, were it not that the Father and Son are essentially one, and the commandment that the Son should die was virtually Divine self-sacrifice. "He who is sent is one in being with him who sends." The atonement of Christ is really the *self-sacrifice of God*.

Hence the only human sacrifice demanded is God incarnate responding to himself. The necessity for thus atoning for human sin at the expense of self-sacrifice is in the main mysterious. But its very mystery makes it more deeply profitable to faith. How great must God's love be when it leads him to lay down his own life and die ignominiously in the interests of men! The ram which was offered in the stead of Isaac is the type of the self-sacrificing Jesus who was offered for us.—R. M. E.

Vers. 1—5.—*Sin at its worst.* There is, perhaps, no development of sin which is more shocking to the renewed mind of man, and more offensive to the pure and gracious heart of God, than that which is here condemned. The verses intimate—

I. THAT SIN SOMETIMES LEADS TO A SHOCKING DISTORTION OF THE HUMAN JUDGMENT. How, we naturally ask, could men ever come to believe in the desirableness of such inhuman rites as those here prohibited? That any Divine Being could possibly be conciliated by the infliction of a cruel death, by the offering up of little children to consuming fires, by this presentation on the part of their own parents! How revolting and incredible seem such ideas! There is no account to be given of it but that sin, as it goes on its maleficent path, not only disfigures the life and corrupts the heart, but also degrades and distorts the understanding of men. It ends in the "evil eye" and so in the "great darkness" of the soul (Matt. vi. 23).

II. THAT GOD CANNOT AND WILL NOT PERMIT THE GLORY WHICH IS DUE TO HIMSELF TO BE GIVEN TO ANOTHER. "I will set my face against that man" (ver. 3). God has emphatically said, "My glory will I not give to another" (Isa. xlvi. 8). The "face of the Lord is against" them that withhold their homage from the Creator, and offer worship and tribute to false gods. This, (1) not on the selfish ground that he can claim and secure something for himself which he desires, after the manner of men, but (2) on the ground that it is in itself right and fit that men should worship the one true God, and (3) also because idolatry is not only a guilty but a mischievous principle working every imaginable harm to those who commit it. If we are keeping back from God and giving to another or to ourselves the thought, interest, affection, regard, which is due to him, we must remember that we make the Almighty our enemy; his "face is against us."

**III. THAT DELIBERATE TRANSGRESSION MAKES ALL WORSHIP UNACCEPTABLE, IF NOT SINFUL.** The man who, while flagrantly violating the Law of Jehovah by "giving his seed unto Molech," presented himself, at the same time, before the tabernacle, was only "defiling the sanctuary" of the Lord and "profaning his holy Name" (ver. 3) by such worthless devotion. God did not desire to see in his presence a man who was wilfully and wantonly committing such a heinous sin. No man is more welcome to the throne of grace than the penitent sinner who is burdened with a sense of guilt and who craves the mercy and help of the Divine Saviour. But let not that man who is cherishing sin in his soul think that his offering is accepted of the Lord. It is hypocrisy, profanation (see Ps. l. 16; Isa. i. 11, 12).

**IV. THAT UNREPENTED SIN MUST BEAR ITS DOOM.** "He shall surely be put to death," etc. (ver. 2); "I will cut him off from among his people" (ver. 3). There is no provision here stated of mercy for the penitent. Probably none was allowed; the exigencies of the situation demanded death under any circumstances. Under the present dispensation there is an offer of Divine mercy to the penitent, whatever their sins may be, however many, however great. But the impenitent must lay their account with the fact that they have offended One who "will by no means clear the guilty," who will "surely" punish and destroy.

**V. THAT CONNIVANCE AT DEADLY SIN IS A GUILTY PARTICIPATION IN WRONG, AND MUST SHARE ITS MISERABLE DOOM.** (Vers. 4, 5.) There are evils at which no friendship however dear, no kinship however close, may dare to wink. We must unsparingly denounce and even determinedly expose.

**VI. THAT THOSE WHO ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE CHURCH'S WELFARE MUST WARN REPEATEDLY AGAINST THE MOST DANGEROUS SINS.** *Again*, "Thou shalt say," etc. (ver. 1).—C.

Ver. 6.—*Credulity and faith.* This, also, is an injunction which Moses had given before, and which he was instructed to repeat (see ch. xix. 31). Our thought may be directed to—

**I. THE PREVALENCE OF IMPOSTURE.** There has never been a time nor a land without its "familiar spirits," its "wizards," or impostors of some kind and name. Men have claimed the power of gaining extraordinary access to the spiritual world, or super-human knowledge of the future, and they have imposed on the ungoverned curiosity of their simple neighbours. The presence of such workers in magic is almost universal. The love of power and the love of money will account for it. So must it be while there is—

**II. THE CORRESPONDING PREVALENCE OF CREDULITY.** The number of "the simple" is very large everywhere. Men and women are always to be found, in pitiful abundance, who will respond to any claim made upon their belief. There is hardly an absurdity too glaring, a falsehood too palpable to be discredited by all. Let the impostor only be confident and pretentious enough, and he will find a number who will listen with eagerness and believe without question or proof.

**III. ITS UTTER DELUSIVENESS.** The entire system is false and rotten throughout; it is a mass of trickery, delusion, and disappointment. 1. Those who practise it soon impose upon themselves; they come to believe that they are really admitted to the secrets of the other world, and they are the victims of their own roguery. Sin tests no one so hard as the sinner himself; its rebound is terrible and deadly. He who, with guilty selfishness, would deceive his fellows, will soon entangle his foot in his own net and perish in his own snare (Ps. vii. 15; ix. 15). 2. They also grossly deceive their neighbours. They who listen to their voice believe that they are holding intercourse with heaven, or are gaining instruction from those supernaturally endowed, when the truth is they are only dealing with men who are unusually wicked, and who should only be heard to be disregarded or denounced.

**IV. ITS SINFULNESS IN THE SIGHT OF GOD.** Resort to imposture is positively wrong. In this book God uttered and repeated his Divine prohibition, and he strengthened his law by attaching the heaviest penalties to disobedience: "I will even set my face against that soul, and will cut him off," etc. The heinousness of the practice probably lay in the fact that it was a deliberate departure from the Lord himself. There was his house, and there were his prophets to resort unto; to pass these by in order to consult pretenders and impostors was to forsake God and to go "a whoring" after other beings and other things. And thus our thought is directed to—

V. THE EXCELLENCY OF A REASONABLE FAITH. The children of Israel had such access to the spiritual world and such knowledge of the future as it was good for men to have. Was not God himself, in manifested presence and in revealing grace, in their camp? Was he not speaking to them as to the future that was before them? Was he not ready to give them prophets who would not impose on them with shameful lies, but guide them with the word of truth? We, too, have all we need without having recourse to subtle and spiritualistic arts. We have: 1. The Word of God upon our tables and in our minds. 2. The devout counsels of wise and holy men. 3. The promised guidance of the Spirit of God. Fictitious arts are sinful and delusive. The wisdom that is from God is not only sound but sufficient. That which is more than this "cometh of evil."—C.

Vers. 7, 8.—*Sanctity—demand, inducement, promise.* Once "again" (ver. 2) Moses utters the Divine will in this great matter of holiness (see cha. xi. 44; xix. 2). We have—

I. GOD'S IMPERATIVE DEMAND OF SANCTITY. "Sanctify yourselves." "Ye shall keep my statutes, and do them." The Creator of the universe, the Author of our being, the Father and Sustainer of our spirits, has sovereign right to speak to us in such decisive tones. He demands of us that we shall be "holy," i.e. (1) that we shall expel from heart and life all those sinful habits by which men have defiled themselves: thus shall we "be severed from other people" (ver. 26), whose spirit and life are hateful; and (2) that we shall approach him, honour him, and pay him the tribute he asks of us, and also act righteously and blamelessly toward our fellows, "keeping his statutes and doing them."

II. THE HIGH INDUCEMENT HE PRESENTS TO US. "Be ye holy: for I am the Lord your God." We may gird ourselves to good and great things, animated by different motives; of these some may be higher, others lower. God summons us to be holy for the highest reason of all, viz. because we shall thus resemble him. "Be ye holy; for I am holy" (1 Pet. i. 16). Other reasons abound: holiness (1) is the best thing in itself; (2) saves us from many and great spiritual evils; (3) delivers us from dark and awful penalties; (4) allies us to the noblest created beings, etc.; but the best and loftiest of all considerations is that (5) it makes us like God, the Holy One, himself. His spirit is our spirit; his principles, our principles; his life, our life. We are "the children of our Father who is in heaven."

III. HIS PROMISED HELP. "I am the Lord which sanctify you." The action of God upon our souls has been treated, both by the foolish and by the wicked, as a reason for human impassiveness. Foolish men have said, "God is working for us and in us, therefore it would be irreverent for us to attempt to do anything; we should only interfere." Wicked men have said, "God works for us, therefore we may safely live in comfortable unconcern and guilt while we wait his time of deliverance." The "children of wisdom" have said, "God is ready to work with us, therefore let us strive with all our energies, for, with his help, we shall not strive in vain." This is the apostle's argument: "Work out your own salvation, . . . for it is God which worketh in you," etc. (Phil. ii. 12, 13). All our endeavours might be unavailing; we might contend against the strong current of sin and be baffled and borne along its stream, but if God himself is sanctifying us, we shall prevail. Let us go forth unto the struggle, for we shall assuredly succeed. God sanctifies us in such wise that he acts *with* us while he acts *in* us and *for* us. He sanctifies us by (1) the truth of his Word (John. xvii. 17): this we are to consult; by (2) the privileges of the sanctuary (Ezek. xxxvii. 28): of these we are to avail ourselves; by (3) his providential discipline (Heb. xii. 10): to this we are to submit; by (4) the indwelling of his Holy Spirit (Rom. xv. 16): for this we are earnestly to pray and expectantly to wait.—C.

Ver. 9 (latter clause).—*The unforgiven.* "His blood shall be upon him;" "their blood shall be upon them" (vers. 13, 16, 27). These words have a deeper significance than a mere repetition of the sentence, "He shall be put to death." They signify this: *his sin cannot be forgiven him.* It was the blood of the animal that "made atonement for the soul" (ch. xvii. 11). It was the shed blood, therefore, that was associated, in thought, with the penalty due to sin. And when the legislator said,

"His blood shall be upon him," he meant his *penalty* shall rest upon him—it shall not be borne and taken away by the blood of the substituted victim. In other words, "He shall bear his iniquity," or the penalty of his iniquity, himself (see ch. vii. 18). There have always been, and there will always be, in the world "the unforgiven;" men, like Cain, who bear about them the brand of an unpardonable offence; sons and daughters who have erred and have not been taken back into parental love; criminals that have lost the place in society which they have no hope of regaining; forlorn wretches that have so sinned against their conscience that they cannot forgive themselves, and have abandoned themselves to a terrible despair. But what of the Divine forgiveness or refusal to forgive? We are taught—

I. THAT PROVISION WAS MADE IN THE LAW FOR THE PARDON OF MANY OFFENCES. This was the end of all the sin and trespass offerings, and on the Day of Atonement "all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions" were "borne away" into the uninhabited land, into the wilderness of oblivion (ch. xvi. 21, 22).

II. THAT UNDER THE LAW THERE WERE OFFENCES WHICH COULD NOT BE THUS ATONED, AND WERE NOT FORGIVEN. Those who wrought shameful acts of idolatry or immorality could bring no oblation to the altar; they could look for no mercy; no blood of atonement was availling; their "blood was upon them," they died before the Lord.

III. THAT, UNDER THE GOSPEL, MERCY IS OFFERED FOR THE WORST TRANSGRESSORS IF THERE BE PENITENCE AND FAITH. The one "unpardonable sin" (Mark iii. 29) is either (1) a sin which was possible in the days of the Incarnation and is absolutely beyond commission now, or (2) consists in that hardening of the heart against the Spirit's influence which results in final impenitence. But where there is repentance toward God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, there is an open gate into the kingdom of God's mercy, into eternal life. No heinousness of offence, no multiplicity of transgressions, bars the way. "By him all that believe are justified from all things, from which they could not be justified by the Law of Moses" (Acts xiii. 39).

IV. THAT MANY SOULS, THOUGH WALKING IN THE LIGHT OF THE GOSPEL, ARE CONTENT TO BANK AMONG THE UNFORGIVEN. In the light, in the full sunshine of privilege and opportunity, there are thousands of men who do not find, because they will not seek, the mercy and the friendship of God. They live unforgiven; "their blood is upon them." They go through life (1) with an oppressive sense of condemnation upon them; (2) excluding themselves from purest spiritual blessedness (Ps. xxxii. 1, 2); (3) voluntarily unfitted for the highest service man can render his brother.

V. THAT THE IMPENITENT PASS INTO THE FUTURE WITH UNFORGIVEN SIN UPON THEIR SOUL. How terrible to pass beyond the line which bounds the period of probation with our "blood upon us;" to pass on (1) to condemnation and reproach at the bar of God, (2) to exile from the heavenly city, (3) to the retribution which the justice of God must inflict! Go, in the day of grace, to the "Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world," through whom there is "remission of sins" (Luke xxiv. 47).—C.

Ver. 23 (latter part).—*God's displeasure with ourselves.* "They committed all these things, and therefore I abhorred them." This expression arrests us by—

I. ITS SOMEWHAT STARTLING STRENGTH. "I abhorred them." Does God positively *abhor* man? the Creator his creature? the Father his child? Are we to understand that the Lord, who is "gracious and full of compassion, slow to anger, and plenteous in mercy," feels an actual *abhorrence* of those beings to whom he is so nearly and intimately related, those human spirits he formed for himself, to reflect his own image and to enjoy his own immortal blessedness? The word startles us; it may well alarm us; it suggests the question, Is it possible that we also may become such that our God may be compelled to look on us with a displeasure which amounts to abhorrence? We look at—

II. THE SAD AND SOLID TRUTH WHICH IT CONTAINS. "God hates the sin and loves the sinner," we say, and truly. Yet this sentence does not cover the whole truth of the case. God does pity the sinner, and seeks to save him. But *he is displeased with him also.* Of anything like malignity or ill will we rejoice to know that the holy and gracious One is absolutely incapable; but we are bound to believe that he feels a sacred and holy resentment against those who violate the laws of righteousness. I. Scripture plainly affirms that he does. "Therefore I abhorred them;" "God is angry

with the wicked every day" (Ps. vii. 11); "the Lord hath been sore displeased with your fathers" (Zech. i. 2); "they vexed his Holy Spirit" (Isa. lxiii. 10); "he looked on them with anger" (Mark iii. 5); to "them that obey unrighteousness" God will render "indignation and wrath" (Rom. ii. 8). 2. It is impossible wholly to separate the act from the agent. An act has no moral qualities at all apart from the disposition and character of him who does it. If our indignation is aroused by any shameful deed, it is because some *one* has wrought that which is wrong, and our feeling *must* extend to the perpetrator as well as to the crime. In theory it must do so; in fact it does so. We cannot see our own children doing that which is guilty without being displeased with *them* as well as excited with indignation against the wrong they have done. Our feelings of holy anger, indignation, righteous grief, etc., may not be *precisely identical* with those which are in the heart of God when he looks down on the sins of his human children, but they *answer to them*; they correspond with them; they enable us to understand how he, our Divine Father, feels toward us when we do those things which are offensive and grievous in his sight. Let us lay it well to heart that by (1) our positive transgressions of his holy Law, (2) our keeping back from him the love and the service which are his due, (3) the continued rejection of his overtures of mercy and reconciliation in Christ Jesus, we are offending, displeasing, grieving God. These our sins are drawing down upon our own souls the awful anger, the high displeasure, of that Almighty God in whom we live, who has ourselves and our future in his right hand of power, whom it is our chief duty, and should be our first desire, to conciliate and please. We glance at—

III. THE WELCOME TRUTH WITH WHICH IT IS CONSISTENT. While God hates sin and is divinely displeased with the sinner, he yet pities the sinner and seeks to save him. He condemns, but he invites. "Is Ephraim my dear son? . . . since I spake against him, I do earnestly remember him still" (Jer. xxxi. 20). As a human father over his lost son or erring daughter, only with immeasurably deeper love, he yearns over his wayward children, and goes out to welcome them home, when, returning to themselves, they return unto him (Luke xv. 11-24).—C.

Ver. 24.—*Three aspects of human life.* The verse suggests three thoughts concerning our human life—

I. THE EXCELLENCE OF OUR ESTATE. "A land that floweth with milk and honey." God gave the Israelites an excellent inheritance when he led them into the land of promise. For beauty, variety of scenery, fertility, etc., it was all that could be desired. Our present estate as citizens of time is one rich and full, a "land flowing," etc. We have: 1. The beauty and grandeur of the world. 2. Human love in its manifold forms, conjugal, parental, filial, fraternal, etc. 3. Sufficiency of all kinds of palatable food. 4. Intellectual gratifications. 5. Spiritual relationships and the sacred, enduring joys which belong to these.

II. THE TENURE UNDER WHICH WE HOLD POSSESSION. "I will give it unto you to possess it." We reckon that we "possess" many things. We call them "ours." We endeavour to secure them to ourselves by carefully drawn documents and witnesses. But what, when all has been done that can be done, is the tenure under which we hold everything? It is not the consent of man, but the will of God. God said to Israel concerning the country of the Canaanites, "Ye shall inherit their land, and I will give it unto you to possess it." He thought well to take it away from its former occupants and give it to them. There were, no doubt, the best reasons for this exchange; but Jehovah evidently assumed his perfect right to dispose as seemed well to him of his own. God always has the best grounds on which to deal with us, raising up or laying low; he never acts capriciously; but he often acts without assigning reasons to us, and in such wise that we cannot make any conjecture thereupon that is even probably true. We must recognize the fact that we hold everything at his will, and be perfectly ready to lay it down or to hand it on to another at the bidding of the Supreme. This is true of (1) our property and position, (2) our mental powers, (3) our health, and (4) our life on earth.

III. THE PAINFUL NEED TO SEPARATE OURSELVES FROM OTHERS. "I am the Lord your God, which have separated you from other people." By their daily habits and social customs (ver. 25), the Jews were cut off from intercourse with other people:

intermarriages were strictly prohibited (Deut. vii. 3, 4); they were to maintain a studied separateness from all surrounding nations. The conscientious service of God our Saviour involves some separateness on our part. 1. We have to form ourselves into separate societies, Christian Churches. From these we are bound, in faithfulness, to exclude those who do not profess to love our Lord Jesus Christ. This will produce resentment on their part, and cause them to ascribe to pride that which is due to simple loyalty to the Master. 2. We have to separate ourselves from those persons and things whose association would be injurious to the cause of Christ; from (1) unholy friendships, (2) institutions and customs which have evil features or evil tendencies, (3) the abounding spirit of worldliness and selfishness. We are bound to make it clear and plain to all that we are "on the Lord's side," and on the side of all those righteous and holy principles which he commands to us.—C.

Vers. 1-27.—*Sin unto death.* The offences described in this chapter were mentioned before. Such is our obtuseness that we need "line upon line." Adorable is that goodness of God which takes such pains with us. We have here—

I. **PRESUMPTUOUS SINS AND THEIR PENALTY.** 1. *Parents giving their seed to Molech.* (1) This infernal god was the King of Tophet (Isa. xxx. 33), and, in malignity, not to be distinguished from Satan. The sacrifices he demanded were human. By a refinement of cruelty he required parents to immolate their own offspring. They were offered to him in the horrible torments of fire. Nothing could be more devilish. (2) In denouncing death as the penalty for this sin, the reason given is that it "defiled the sanctuary and profaned the holy Name" of God (ver. 3). The temple and the Shechinah were in the land, and to commit this wickedness there was consequently to commit the highest crime against the most awful sacredness. Also the body of man is the temple of God, and to give that temple to Molech was, in this sense, to defile the temple of God (see 1 Cor. vi. 15; x. 21). (3) The penalty is denounced in order upon the Hebrew first. Having more light, he is in a higher degree responsible, and therefore is the first named to suffer (comp. Rom. ii. 9). Let not Protestant Christians forget their great responsibility. (4) But the "strangers that sojourn in Israel" are amenable to the same punishment. They must not abuse their hospitality by showing an example of wickedness. This consideration should restrain the licentiousness in foreign countries of some of our travellers. 2. *Persons having dealings with necromancy.* (1) The *principals* in this. Those "who have familiar spirits," or demons attendant upon them and obedient to their calls. "Wizards," or wise ones, *viz.* to pry into the "depths of Satan" (ver. 27). Such persons are accounted guilty of the highest crime, and were doomed to suffer death by stoning, without mercy. (2) Their *customers*. Those who have recourse to such abandoned persons to discover things which it has not pleased God to reveal. Such prurience into Divine mysteries is defiling (ver. 6; ch. xix. 31). (3) Those who would be sanctified by God must first sanctify themselves from these abominations. If they refuse to do this, God will sanctify himself of them by cutting them off (vers. 6, 8). 3. *Children who curse their parents.* (1) Those guilty of this irreverence must be woefully destitute of the fear of God (see ch. xix. 32). Our fathers according to the flesh are to us representatives of our Father in heaven. (2) So heinous is this crime that it must be punished with death. There is no atonement for it. "His blood shall be upon him." He must be made himself the sacrifice for his sin. What an admonition to the fast youth of modern times! 4. *Excesses in uncleanness.* (1) Death, in one form or another, is the penalty for the horrible crimes specified (vers. 10-21). "Their blood shall be upon them;" "they shall be cut off from among their people;" "they shall bear their iniquity;" "they shall be stoned;" "they shall be burnt;" "they shall die childless." (2) In this last the retribution must come speedily. Their cutting off out of the land of the living must be before any issue could come of their crime. It may also imply that any issue they may have already should be involved in the punishment of their sin (comp. Numb. xvi. 32; Josh. vii. 24).

II. **THE RESPONSIBILITY OF WITNESSES.** 1. *To withhold testimony against sin is to incur its guilt.* (1) It is here taken as complicity in the crime. He that "hides his eyes from the man" that giveth his seed to Molech, so as to let him escape the hands of justice, is said to "commit whoredom with Molech" (vers. 4, 5). What a lesson is here to "peaceable" Christians who let swearers and other public offenders go un-

reproved! (2) He that "hides his eyes," in this case, is visited with excommunication. For complicity in this gross idolatry, here described as "whoredom," God, as a jealous husband, gives his writing of divorcement. "I will set my face against that man, . . . and will cut him off from among his people." Not only is he expelled from the Church, but also from the nation, if not in addition doomed to suffer a violent death (comp. chs. xvii. 10; xxvi. 17; Jer. xliv. 11—14; Ezek. xiv. 7—9; xv. 7). (3) For this culpable want of zeal for the honour of God, the tacit accomplice in the abominations of Molech involves also his family in his punishment (ver. 5). How many illustrations of this principle have we in the history of the kings! (see Exod. xx. 7). Sin is a desperate evil, and requires a strong hand to deal with it. 2. *The testimony against sin is a sanctification to the witness* (vers. 7, 8). (1) The faithful witness thereby sanctifies himself. (a) He clears himself of all complicity. (b) He approves himself to God as zealous for his truth, purity, and honour. (c) He fulfils the part of a true patriot; for nations are exalted by righteousness and ruined by crime. Public duty may cost us inconvenience, but it must not be neglected. (2) He is sanctified by the Lord (ver. 8). God will honour them that honour him. (a) He will bring them to dwell in the land (ver. 22). This possession was the earnest of the better Canaan. It was a "land flowing with milk and honey." (b) He will watch over them as a proprietor over precious treasure. "They shall be mine" (ver. 26; Exod. xix. 5, 6; Deut. vii. 6; Ps. cxxxv. 4). "Blessed are the people whose God is the Lord."—J. A. M.

Vers. 1—27.—*Punishments assigned to presumptuous sins.* I. THE LAW OF SOCIETY RESTS ON THE HIGHER LAW OF GOD. All legislation should be thus divinely sanctioned. The Bible is not a statute-book for nations, but a book of principles—to give light to the mind and heart of man as man. We must not enforce human law on Divine grounds, but we can use Divine revelation to ascertain the most satisfactory laws.

II. PUNISHMENTS vary from age to age and country to country, but the reason of punishment remains. The honour of the Law satisfied is the way of life opened.

III. The comparison between the Law and the gospel suggested by this chapter reveals the grace of God, the progress of humanity, the ultimate destiny of the race. The gradual extinction of the sins is the extinction of the laws which provided against them. "If ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the Law" (see Gal. v., and comp. Jas. i., ii.). The perfect law of liberty is a fulfilment of the old law, and therefore a blotting out of the handwriting of ordinances and nailing of them to the cross of Christ.—R.

## PART III.

### SECTION IV.

#### THE UNCLEANNESS AND DISQUALIFICATION OF PRIESTS.

#### EXPOSITION.

##### CHAPTER XXI.

The two remaining chapters of this division of the book (chs. xxi., xxii.) deal with the case of defilements attaching to the priesthood, over and above those which affect othermen, whether ceremonial (chs. xxi. 1—6, 10—12; xxii. 1—9) or moral (ch. xxi. 7—9, 13—15); with the physical defects disqualifying men of the priestly family from ministering at the altar (ch. xxi. 16—24); with the privilege of eating of the holy things (ch. xxii. 10—18); ending with the

injunction that the sacrificial victims, no less than the priests who sacrificed them, should be unblemished and perfect of their kind.

Vers. 1—6.—The first paragraph refers to ceremonial uncleanness derived to the priest from his family relations. The priest may not take part in any funeral rites, the effect of which was legal defilement, except in the case of the death of his father, mother, son, daughter, brother, and unmarried sister. These are all that appear to be mentioned. But what, then, are we to understand regarding his wife? Was the

LEVITICUS.

X

priest allowed to take part in mourning ceremonies for her or not? It is thought by some that her case is met by ver. 4, But he shall not defile himself, being a chief man among his people, to profane himself. The literal translation of this verse is, *He shall not be defiled, a lord (baal) among his people.* The word *baal*, or *lord*, is commonly used in the sense of *husband*. The clause, therefore, may be understood to forbid the priest to mourn for his wife, being rendered, *He shall not defile himself as an husband (i.e. for his wife) among his people.* This, however, is something of a forced rendering. The words are better understood to mean, *He shall not defile himself as a master of a house among his people*; that is, he may not take part in the funeral rites of slaves or other members of the household, which ordinarily brought defilement on the master of a house. Then is the priest forbidden to mourn for his wife? This we can hardly believe, when he might mourn for father and mother, son and daughter, brother and sister. Nor is it necessary to take this view. For the case of the wife is covered by the words, *For his kin, that is near unto him, . . . he may be defiled.* The wife, being so closely attached to the husband, is not specifically named, because that was not necessary, but is included under the expression, *his kin, that is near unto him*, just as daughter, grandmother, niece, and wife's sister, are covered by the phrase, "near of kin," without being specifically named in ch. xviii. (see note on ch. xviii. 18). Even when mourning is permitted, the priest is to use no excessive forms of it, still less any that have been used by idolaters. *They shall not make baldness upon their head, neither shall they shave off the corner of their beard* (see ch. xix. 27), nor make any cuttings in their flesh (see ch. xix. 28). And the reason why they are to avoid ceremonial uncleanness in some cases, and to act with sobriety and gravity in all, is that they are dedicated to God, to offer the offerings of the Lord made by fire, the bread of their God; that is, the sacrifices which are consumed by the fire of the altar symbolizing the action of God (see note on ch. iii. 11).

Vers. 7—9.—Moral uncleanness or defilement passes to the husband and father from an immoral wife or daughter, and therefore the priest is to be specially careful in the selection of his wife; and his daughter, if she leads a licentious life, is to be stoned to death, and then burnt with fire, because she profaneth her father (cf. 1 Sam. ii. 17). In a similar spirit, St. Paul gives directions as to the families of those to whom the ministry of the Spirit is assigned (1 Tim. iii. 11; Titus i. 6). Keil would unite ver. 4 in sense with vers. 7—9, and argues

that *he shall not defile himself, being a chief man among his people, to profane himself*, refers to the kind of marriage which the priest is to make, but the interposition of vers. 5 and 6 forbid this explanation of ver. 4.

Vers. 10—15.—The high priest, upon whose head the anointing oil was poured, and that is consecrated to put on the garments, symbolizing in his person the Holy One in a more special manner than the other priests, has to aim so much the more at symbolical holiness. He may not, therefore, incur legal uncleanness by taking part in the funeral rites, even of his father or mother, not being permitted to absent himself from the sanctuary, which he would have to do if he had thus ceremonially defiled himself. Nor is it enough that he should abstain from taking an immoral or a divorced wife; he may only wed a virgin and of his own people, whereas the other priests might marry widows and the daughters of strangers dwelling among the Israelites. In the ordinances for priests given in Ezek. xliv., the ordinary priests, as well as the high priest, are forbidden to marry widows, unless they be the widows of priests (Ezek. xliv. 22).

Vers. 16—24.—Perfection of the body being typical of perfection of the mind and of the whole man, and symbolical perfection being required of the priest of God, none may be admitted to the priesthood with bodily defects, or excrescences, or grievous blemishes. The translation *dwarf*, in ver. 20, is better than the marginal rendering "too slender," or withered. Being the descendants of Aaron, these priests, blemished as they were, were to be supported as the other priests were supported. *He shall eat the bread of his God, both of the most holy, and of the holy*; that is, the priests' portions of the meat offerings (chs. ii. 3, 10; vi. 17), of the sin offerings (ch. vi. 29), of the trespass offerings (ch. vii. 1), of the shewbread (ch. xxiv. 9), which were most holy, and of the heave offerings, wave offerings, firstfruit offerings, firstlings, and things devoted (Numb. xi. 11—19), which were holy. They were also apparently employed in the less formal and conspicuous duties of the priests, such as examining lepers, and any other functions which did not bring them nigh unto the altar. But they were not to profane God's sanctuaries, by which is meant the holy of holies, the holy place, and the court in which the altar stood. To none of these is the blemished priest to be admitted for the purpose of officiating, though he might enter the court and probably the holy place for other purposes, and might eat the offerings of the priests in the accustomed place.

## HOMILETICS.

Vers. 7—9.—*The marriage of the clergy*, according to the discipline of the reformed Churches, is one of the points on which the latter bear a marked superiority to the Latin Church, which forbids its bishops and priests to marry; and to the Greek Church, which expects its priests to be married before ordination, forbids them to marry a second time, and requires celibacy in its bishops.

I. **IT IS MORE SCRIPTURAL.** In the Old Testament, the priests had the liberty of marriage; in the New Testament, the bishops or presbyters had the liberty of marriage, and Timothy and Titus are instructed by St. Paul to select married men for the clerical office (1 Tim. iii. 2, 4; Titus i. 6).

II. **IT IS MORE PRIMITIVE.** The misinterpretation of St. Paul's words, "the husband of one wife" (which, rightly interpreted, mean "a man faithful to one woman"), led in early time to the Greek discipline; but the Latin practice, condemned by the Greeks in the Council in Trullo, was not enforced upon the whole of the Western Church until the eleventh century, nor is it universal in it now.

III. **IT IS MORE HUMAN.** The attempt to crush instead of regulate God-given instincts, whether by philosophical sects or religious bodies, has always led to unspeakable evils. In the present case it has led to (1) immorality, as testified by the history of every country in which the practice has existed; (2) inhumanity, as exhibited in the Inquisition and at the stake, such as a celibate priesthood could alone have been guilty of; (3) disloyalty, which is naturally felt by those who, having their natural ties to their country severed, become the spiritual police of a foreign power.

IV. **DUTIES CONNECTED WITH IT.** 1. For each individual clergyman—to determine whether marriage will or will not "serve better to godliness" (Art. XXXII.). 2. To select a wife who will be "a help meet for him" (Gen. ii. 20). 3. To be "a man of one woman" (1 Tim. iii. 2; Titus i. 6), that is, faithful to his wife. 4. To "rule well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity" (1 Tim. iii. 4); "having faithful children not accused of riot or unruly" (Titus i. 6). 5. "To be diligent to form and fashion himself and his family according to the doctrine of Christ, and to make both himself and it, as much as in him lieth, wholesome examples and patterns to the flock of Christ" (Ordering of Priests). 6. For the wife and family—to follow his godly monitions, and to abstain from amusements of doubtful character or tendency.

V. **MINOR ADVANTAGES ATTACHED TO IT.** It gives occasion for the growth in the clergy of those graces of character which come from the cultivation and exercise of the affections—love, cheerfulness, self-restraint for the sake of others, hopes and fears for others—all of which are a prevention of selfishness. It gives a willing and unpaid body of assistants in ministerial work which, though not purely spiritual, has yet to be done by the clergy. It forms a natural link between the clergyman and his parishioners. It ensures the education of a considerable class throughout the country in the principles of religion. It spreads the practices of a religious household to households beyond the clergyman's home, by the natural effects of intermarriage and friendly intercourse. It gives a safe home to many girls seeking domestic service. It dissipates the false idea that the state of celibacy is a purer and more chaste condition than that of matrimony. It gives an opportunity of learning by experience the working of young people's minds and hearts, and women's feelings, which is not, as a rule, to be otherwise safely attained by the clergy.

## HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

*Priestly qualifications.* Ch. xxi.; cf. Heb. vii. 26—28; 1 Tim. iii. 1—12. From the moralities of the common people we have now to pass to the morality of the priestly class. As special officers, they require special qualifications. Not that there are to be two moralities in the Church of God. This idea is most baneful. Rather do the Divine regulations contemplate the rise of the whole people eventually into an ideal,

which both classes are only distantly striving after. The priests, by conforming to certain regulations, were really showing to the people what all should eventually be as the people of God. Keeping this in view, we may profitably notice three requisites of the priesthood.

I. PHYSICAL PERFECTION. God ordained that he should be served only by men physically perfect. A physical blemish disqualified a man from *office*, though not from *support*. This was surely to show that it is the perfect whom God purposes to gather around him. It is not descent nor connection, but personal perfection, which qualifies for Divine service.

Now, in this present life, the ideal was only once realized, viz. in the person of the Great High Priest, Jesus Christ. He was physically and he was spiritually perfect. He was "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners." In him, therefore, God secured a perfect servant.

And although God's servants do not as yet realize this idea of personal perfection, they are on the way to realize it. This constitutes the kernel of our Christian hope. The will of God is our sanctification; that is, our perfect adaptation in body, soul, and spirit for his service. Through the grace of God we are "going on to perfection," and a time is coming when we shall be presented "without spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing" before God. Hence we take this physical perfection required of the priests as a promise of perfection through grace in God's own time, that we may all serve him as priests in the sanctuary on high.

II. DOMESTIC PURITY. The Jewish priesthood were educated in the family for their work in the Church of God. Celibacy and isolation were not deemed conducive to sanctity of service. The priest was to be the head of a household, particular in selecting a pure and suitable wife, and ruling his household well. It may be safely asserted that it is only in such circumstances that a full experience of human nature and society can ordinarily be secured. The family is the Divine unit, the training-school for the larger society, the Church. Unless the priests, therefore, had a proper position at home, and governed properly their own households, they were not likely to rule well in the Church of God. Eli's case is surely one in point. A slack hand at home, he showed similar slackness in his public administration, and the interests of religion suffered.

And just as in the former case physical perfection betokened the personal perfection of the future life which the Lord's servants are to secure, so the domestic purity of the priesthood betokens the *perfect society* into which the Lord's people are to come. We see a similar adumbration of this in the New Testament direction about bishops and deacons being the husbands of proper wives and ruling their households well. The government in families is the preparation for the government in the Church of God. The reason is that the Church is the larger family. And so is the completed Church above to be a perfect family. We are on the way to a family circle and a family life of which the home circle on earth is the shadow. God will give his people the opportunity of serving him amid perfect social conditions.

It is in following up this thought that the Church collectively is likened to a pure and perfect bride—the Lamb's wife. It is the same thought which likens heaven to an everlasting *home*. And, indeed, society, as thus constituted and secured, is but the outcome of that Divine nature which, as a Trinity in unity, secured for itself perfect society from everlasting, and creates the same in the glorious purposes of grace.<sup>1</sup>

III. PUBLIC SPIRIT. We mention this as a third characteristic of the priesthood. This was illustrated in perfection by the high priest, who was to allow no private sorrow to interfere with his public service. The other priests were allowed more liberty in this regard, although theirs also had very definite limits; but the one great principle reinforced by these regulations was public spirit. The priest was to feel that, as a public officer, a representative man, it was his duty to sacrifice the personal and private to the common weal.

Now, it is instructive to observe that it was this principle which Jesus carried out all through. His life and death were the sacrifice of the private and the personal to the public need. The same spirit is imparted by the grace of God, and is more or less

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Pressense's admirable volume, 'La Famille Chrétienne,' *passim*.

faithfully carried out by the Lord's people. Moreover, we are on the way to its perfect illustration in the felicities of the heavenly world. There none shall be for self or for a party, but all for the common weal. Lord Macaulay represents ancient Rome as the embodiment of public spirit.

"Then none was for a party;  
Then all were for the State;  
Then the great man helped the poor,  
And the poor man loved the great;  
Then lands were fairly portioned;  
Then spoils were fairly sold;  
The Romans were like brothers  
In the brave days of old."

However faithfully this reflects the condition of things in the golden age of Rome, one thing is certain, that the public spirit it indicates shall have its perfect embodiment in the society above. Public life, divested of all suspicion of selfishness, will characterize God's redeemed ones. All personal and private interests shall then merge themselves in the common weal, and as his servants serve God, they shall see his face and live out his public spirit.—R. M. E.

Vers. 1—24.—*Law of holiness for the priests.* In all circumstances and relations of life the priests must be an example of purity. The higher the office, the more conspicuous the example, and therefore the more solemn the duty of preserving both body and soul from defilement.

I. THE BLAMELESSNESS OF THE MINISTRY A NECESSITY OF THE CHURCH'S LIFE.  
1. Spiritual leaders a natural requirement and a Divine appointment. We want teachers both in word and act. The priesthood of the old dispensation was abolished, but in the new there are those who, both by their superior knowledge and piety and by their consecration of life to the sanctuary, become the responsible leaders of the Church.  
2. An impure priesthood the greatest calamity to the cause of religion. Like priest, like people. The corruptions of the Middle Ages mainly traceable to the defilement of those who should have been first and foremost in faithfulness to truth and duty. The hindrance to the spread of Christianity now is largely the indifference and blindness and worldliness of those who serve the sanctuary. The life of the public representative of religion should be above reproach in all things.

II. GOD'S HOUSE AND CAUSE SHOULD HAVE THE CHOICEST AND BEST OF HUMAN CAPACITY AND ENERGY DEVOTED TO IT. 1. That the Church itself may be edified and become a praise unto God. Our religion demands and satisfies our highest efforts. The truth of God's Word is inexhaustible food for the mind and delight to the heart. Endless scope for the development of human powers in the service of God. Worship should be spotlessly pure, a glorifying of humanity in the light of Divine favour. 2. The world is won to God, not by hiding the graces of God's people, but by making the light to shine before men. No limit to the demand upon the talents and energies of the Church. We should urge those naturally gifted and superior to take their proper places. Yet natural defects can be wonderfully supplied by special Divine gifts. Much work has been done by the physically weak, and even by those whose characters were faulty.—R.

Vers. 1—15.—*Distinctions and degrees in obligation.* In the kingdom of God there is, as a rule, but one law for all subjects. What applies to one applies to another. The same principles of righteousness are obligatory on both sexes, on all classes, conditions, nations, generations of men. This is importantly true; but it is a truth subject to certain not unimportant qualifications. Of this latter we have—

I. ILLUSTRATIONS IN THE MOSAIC LAW. 1. Respecting ceremonial defilement certain distinctions were drawn. (1) The commonalty were bound to avoid all defilement (by touching the dead, etc.), whenever it was practicable to do so; but it was anticipated that they would be compelled, sometimes, to become unclean, and legal purifications were accordingly enjoined. (2) But the priests were to take peculiar care not to incur this ceremonial defilement (vers. 1—4). Allowance was made for natural human feeling (vers. 2, 3), but the occasions when they might permit themselves to become

unclean were carefully prescribed. (3) And the high priest was not permitted to incur defilement by "going in to any dead body" under any circumstances whatever, not even "for his father, or for his mother" (ver. 11). 2. So, respecting marriage alliances: (1) the whole people were under certain severe prohibitions (Deut. vii. 3, 4); but (2) the priests were more circumscribed (ver. 7); and (3) the high priest was still more limited in his choice (vers. 13, 14). The Hebrew nation was holy unto the Lord, and was required to separate itself from the actions of surrounding peoples; the priests were peculiarly holy, and must, therefore, be especially careful to walk in purity; the high priest was, in position and function, the holiest of all, and on him it was most particularly incumbent to shun every possible defilement, and to do that which was purest and worthiest in the sight of God. We have to consider what are—

II. THE ILLUSTRATIONS OF THIS PRINCIPLE UNDER THE GOSPEL. 1. Respecting the avoidance of evil, we may say that (1) the members of the Church of Christ are bound to avoid all appearance of wrong. They who bear the Name of the holy Saviour, though humblest members of the smallest Church, are, as professed followers of his, bound to walk as becometh the gospel of Christ, in all purity of heart and blamelessness of life; but (2) ministers of his Church, and their sons and daughters (vers. 9, 15), are especially bound to shun everything which would bring discredit on the holy Name of the Divine Redeemer (see 1 Tim. iii. 2-7; Titus i. 6-9). 2. And respecting the contraction of intimate alliances (especially the life-long alliance, marriage), we may contend that (1) all who are the avowed followers of Christ are bound to be circumspect in this most important matter (see 1 Cor. vii. 39; 2 Cor. vi. 14). The subject of forming a life-long alliance, by which such serious spiritual consequences must inevitably follow to two human souls, and such great and immeasurable results may follow, affecting numbers of human hearts and lives, and reaching to the most distant time, is not to be dismissed to the region of harmless but helpless humour, nor is it to be left to the direction of careless fancy or of worldly policy; it is a matter for the exercise of the fullest, profoundest, heavenliest wisdom which man and woman can command. (2) Of those who minister in the Church of Christ, it is yet more urgently demanded that in the intimacies they form and the life-long friendships they contract, they shall have regard not to a transient whim, nor to worldly advantage, but, first and foremost, to the glory of Christ and the well-being of those whom they live to serve.—C.

Vers. 16-24.—Unblemished service. We gain three truths from these verses.

I. THE PRIMARY TRUTH, INTENDED FOR THE HEBREW NATION. The special instruction contained in this passage is that the altar of God was to be honoured in every possible way; therefore to be preserved from everything that would bring it into disregard; and therefore to be unapproached by any priest who had a bodily blemish. It was impossible for the people to dissociate the altar itself from those who ministered theret; if, therefore, any physical disfigurement had been allowed, and those who were uncomely or misshapen had been permitted to officiate, the sacred ordinances of God would have suffered, in some degree, from the association in thought of the man with the thing. The priest with a blemish might not "come nigh unto the altar, . . . that he profane not my sanctuaries" (ver. 23). We may learn, in passing, that it is almost impossible to overestimate the influence for good or ill which is unconsciously exerted by those who minister, in any function, in the Church of Christ on the popular estimate of their office.

II. THE SECONDARY TRUTH, APPLICABLE TO US ALL. In a typical system it is necessary that the body should frequently represent the soul, the organs of the one picturing the faculties of the other. The requirement of a perfect bodily frame on the part of those who "approached to offer the bread of their God" (ver. 17), intimated to them, and now indicates to us, the essential and eternal truth that *the best is to be brought to the service of God*: not that with which we can most easily part, but the very best that we can bring. 1. Not the unattractive service ("flat nose," "scabbed," etc.), but that which is as beautiful and inviting in its form as we can make it. 2. Not unacquaintance with our subject ("a blind man"), but the fullest possible acquisition and understanding. 3. Not an example which is defective, a walking which is irregular (a "lame man," "crookbackt"), but an upright, honourable demeanour, "walking in the commandments of the Lord blameless." 4. Not

a feeble and faltering delivery ("brokenhanded"), but a facile, skilful "handling of the Word of God." We may note, before we pass, that the God whom we serve is *expectant, but is not inconsiderate*. He who refuses to allow a priest with any blemish "to approach to offer the bread of his God," expressly desired that such priest should "eat the bread of his God, both of the most holy, and of the holy" (ver. 22); he might not serve, but he should not suffer, on account of a bodily misfortune. God requires of us that, in approaching him, we should bring not our exhaustion but our freshness, not our hurried but our patient preparation, not our remnants but our substance, not our worthless belongings but our worthiest self; at the same time, he makes every allowance for our weakness, our infirmity, our human feebleness and frailty: "he knoweth our frame; he remembereth that we are dust."

III. A FURTHER TRUTH, RELATING TO THE FUTURE LIFE. We dare not hope to render to God any absolutely unblemished service here. "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves" (1 John i. 8). Here our holiest services are marred by spiritual imperfection. It should be our aim, our prayer, our endeavour, to make our worship, our work, and our life as little blemished as may be; to make all our service as elevated in spirit and motive as may be; and doing this, we may look confidently and joyously onward to the time when "his servants shall serve him" in the very fulness of their strength and joy, and when their service shall be not only undimmed by any gathering tear, but unstained with any rising thought of sin.—C.

Vers. 1—24.—*The perfection of the priesthood.* The priests, when officiating, and eminently so the high priest, were types of Christ. It was, therefore, needful that they should be holy and without blemish. They were also types of Christians, in which capacity also they must be holy, for true Christians are so, though not always without blemish. In any case, then—

I. THE PRIESTS MUST BE HOLY. 1. *They must be holy, as types of Christ.* (1) They "offered the bread of their God." So the "offerings made by fire" are called (ver. 6). The fire of the altar of Calvary is the Godhead in which the body of Christ became a sacrifice upon which the justice and mercy of God can feast. Christ, as our Priest, thus offers himself unto God. (2) They are "crowned" with the "anointing oil of their God" (vers. 10, 12). The anointing represented the lustre of the Holy Spirit's grace. When Jesus was "anointed with the oil of gladness" on the holy mount, he was "crowned with glory and honour," and that too "for the suffering of death" (comp. Heb. ii. 9; 2 Pet. i. 17). Thus was he "consecrated to put on the garments" of his resurrection, to enter the holy places for us (ver. 10). 2. *They must not defile themselves by mourning for the dead.* (1) If not officiating, they might defile themselves for kindred of the first degree. For a mother, father, son, daughter, brother, and for a sister that is a virgin. But not for a sister that is married. She is "one flesh" with her husband, incorporated in another family. (2) For his wife he shall not mourn (see ver. 4, margin; also Ezek. xxiv. 16—18). The wife of the true Priest is his Church; and she can never die; the gates of Hades cannot prevail against her (Matt. xvi. 18). Even her members do not suffer through death; it is but the gate of their promotion (John xi. 25, 26). (3) He must not make marks of distraction—baldness, quarters in the beard, cuttings in the flesh (ver. 5). What has the type of Christ to do with the abominations of the heathen? In profaning themselves they profaned their God (see ver. 6; and comp. John i. 14). (4) The priest officiating must not mourn; nor shall he leave the sanctuary to defile it. Jehovah dwells in the sanctuary of Christ's Body. The priesthood can never leave that sanctuary (ver. 12; Heb. vii. 23—28). 3. *They must be holy in their marriage.* (1) No priest must marry a whore, or one deflowered or divorced (ver. 7). The Babylonish harlot, then, however impudent and specious her pretensions, cannot be the Bride of Christ. Those who would be joined to Christ must not seek membership with her (Rev. xvii. 1—5; xviii. 4). (2) The bride of the high priest must be a virgin of his own people (vers. 13, 14). The descriptions of the true Church of Christ are widely different from those of the woman of the seven-hilled city (see 2 Cor. xi. 2; Eph. v. 27; Rev. xii. and xxi.). (3) His children must be holy (ver. 14). They are the children of the truth; the seed of Abraham's faith. If his daughter play the whore, she defiles him; and to purify him-

self he must give her up to be burnt with fire (ver. 9; Gen. xxxviii. 24). Such, accordingly, is to be the fate of the 'scarlet lady' (Rev. xvii. 16, 17; xviii. 9, 10; xix. 2, 3).

II. THE PRIESTS MUST BE WITHOUT BLEMISH. 1. *Those who typified Christ must be so.* (1) We have an enumeration of blemishes, any of which would disqualify for that sacred office (vers. 18—20). No doubt Jesus was physically, as well as mentally and spiritually, a perfect human being. Those expressions in Isaiah (lii. 14; liii. 2) obviously had reference to his sufferings and humiliations. (2) He that had a blemish among the sons of Aaron "must not come nigh to offer the bread of his God." Had not Christ been perfectly free from sin, he could not have atoned for us (ver. 17; 1 Pet. i. 19). (3) "He shall not go in unto the *vail*" (ver. 23). He shall not represent him that is the Way to heaven, who is qualified to sanctify the people with his own blood (Heb. vii. 26—28; xiii. 10). 2. *Blemished priests might represent Christians.* (1) "The bread of their God they may eat" (ver. 22). Men that have infirmities may live on Christ; but he that represents that Bread must be without blemish. (2) Blemished ones might eat of the holy things, but unclean ones must not. Between infirmities and sins there is a wide difference. Infirmities do not exclude men from fellowship with God, but sins do (Isa. lix. 1, 2; Rom. viii. 35—39). Those who eat the bread of the Eucharist should be holy in life, else they profane the Name they profess to revere. (3) Too frequently have blemished priests represented gospel ministers. The New Testament gives laws to ministers and their wives; and those who instruct others should do so by example as well as precept (1 Tim. iii. 11; iv. 12). They should not be "blind," viz. to the meaning of God's Word. They should not be "lame" in hand or foot, but able to show an example in working and walking. They must have nothing superfluous nor deficient. "They must not be wise *above*," or wise *without*, "that which is written." The priest who was "holy to his God" was, therefore, to be holy to his people (vers. 6—8); and so must the gospel minister be esteemed for his work's sake (1 Thess. v. 18).—J. A. M.

## EXPOSITION.

### CHAPTER XXII.

This chapter, which is a continuation of ch. xxi., (1) commands that the ceremonially defiled priest shall not officiate or partake of the sacrificial offerings; (2) declares who may and who may not partake of the priests' portions of the sacrifices; (3) orders that every sacrificial victim be unblemished.

Vers. 1—9.—In the previous chapter, the priests have been commanded to avoid occasions of ceremonial defilement, but there are times in which they must be unclean. At these times they are here instructed that they must abstain from their priestly functions, and not even eat of the priests' portions until they have been cleansed. The command to Aaron and to his sons, that they separate themselves from the holy things of the children of Israel, in ver. 2, must be read in the light of the following verses, and understood to mean that they are to separate themselves from the holy things when they are unclean. The different forms of uncleanness which are to produce this effect are enumerated in vers. 4—6. In most cases the uncleanness would not last

beyond sunset on the day on which it was incurred, but occasionally, as when a priest became a leper, a permanent disqualification would be caused, or one that lasted for a considerable length of time. The law with respect to abstaining from holy things while unclean is to be of permanent obligation. Whoever disobeys it is to be cut off from God's presence; that is, he is to be excluded from the sanctuary by being deprived of his priestly office. Ver. 8 repeats the prohibition of eating flesh containing blood.

Vers. 10—13.—The previous paragraph having forbidden the priests to eat of the holy things while in a state of ceremonial uncleanness, naturally leads to the question, Who has the right of eating them? The answer is, the priest's family. The members of the priest's family here specified are those only about whom any question might have arisen, namely, the slaves, who, as being incorporated into the priest's household, have a right of eating of the priestly food not enjoyed by lodgers in his house or by servants hired with his money; and married daughters who have returned to their father's roof in consequence of the death of their husband, or of being divorced, without any

children of their own. Under these circumstances, it is ruled that they become once more a part of the priest's family, and able to exercise the privileges of that position. The priest's wife and sons and unmarried daughters are not here mentioned, as no question arose about them.

Ver. 14.—As the sacrificial meals made a part of the stipends of the priestly body, any one who inadvertently took a share in them by eating of the holy thing unwittingly, when he had no right to do so, had to refund the value of the meat, with one fifth, that is, twenty per cent., added to it. He thus acknowledged that he had "committed a trespass in the holy things of the Lord," the case falling under the rule given in ch. v. 15, 16, "And he shall make amends for the harm that he hath done in the holy thing, and shall add the fifth part thereto, and give it unto the priest." In the fifth chapter a trespass offering of a ram is also ordered, which, though not specified, is probably understood here also.

Vers. 15, 16.—These verses present some difficulties of construction. The rendering of the Authorized Version is as follows: *And they shall not profane the holy things of the children of Israel, which they offer unto the Lord; or suffer them to bear the iniquity of trespass, when they eat their holy things: for I the Lord do sanctify them.* If this rendering is accepted, it would mean that the priests are not to profane the holy things by any irregularity on their part as to the eating of them, nor to suffer laymen to incur the guilt of a trespass by eating them. The marginal rendering, which is to be preferred, gives the passage as follows: *And they shall not profane the holy things of the children of Israel, which they offer unto the Lord; or lade themselves with the iniquity of trespass in their eating.* According to this translation, the meaning would be that laymen (who had been spoken of in the previous verse) should not profane the holy things, or become guilty of a trespass (as defined in ver. 15) by eating them. Technically and literally, David was guilty of this trespass in an aggravated form, when he and his followers ate the shewbread at Nob (1 Sam. xxi. 6), for the shewbread was not only holy, but most holy. But his act is excused by our Lord, on the plea of necessity (Matt. xii. 3, 4), even though it was done on the sabbath day (1 Sam. xxi. 5, margin).

Vers. 17—25.—Just as the priests who offer to the Lord are to be ceremonially and morally holy, so the animals offered to him are to be physically perfect, in order (1) to be types of a future perfect Victim, (2) to symbolize the "perfect heart" which God requires to be given to him, and (3) to teach the duty of offering to him of our best. *Whatsoever*

*hath a blemish, that shall ye not offer.* The list of blemishes and malformations which exclude from the altar is given; they are such as deform the animal, and make it less valuable: *blind, or broken, or maimed, or having a wen, or scurvy, or scabbed, ye shall not offer these unto the Lord, nor any animal that is bruised, or crushed, or broken, or cut, that is, castrated in any manner.* The clause following the mention of castration—*neither shall ye make any offering thereof in your land*—literally translated, *neither shall ye make in your land*, probably forbids castration altogether, not merely the offering of castrated animals in sacrifice. The expression, *Ye shall offer at your own will*, should be understood, as before, *for your acceptance* (see note on ch. ii. 1). Only one exception is made as to blemished offerings; an animal that *hath any thing superfluous or lacking in his parts* may be offered for a freewill offering, but not for a vow (for the distinction of these offerings, see note on ch. vii. 16). These rules as to unblemished victims are to apply to the offerings of strangers as well as of Israelites.

Vers. 26, 27.—Extreme youth is to be regarded as a blemish in an animal in the same way as other defects. During the young creature's first week of existence it is not considered as having arrived at the perfection of its individual and separate life, and therefore only from the eighth day and thenceforth it shall be accepted for an offering made by fire unto the Lord. Up to what age an animal might be offered is not stated. Gideon is narrated as offering a bullock of seven years old (Judg. vi. 25).

Vers. 28.—A lesson of charity is added. A young animal and its mother are not to be killed (though reference is specially made to sacrifice, the general word, not the sacrificial term, for slaying is used) on the same day, just as the kid is not to be seethed in its mother's milk (Exod. xxiii. 19; Deut. xiv. 21), nor the mother bird be taken from the nest with the young (Deut. xxii. 6). Thus we see that the feelings of the human heart are not to be rudely shocked by an act of apparent cruelty, even when no harm is thereby done to the object of that act. Mercy is to be taught by forbidding anything which may blunt the sentiment of mercy in the human heart.

Vers. 29, 30.—Two forms of peace offerings, the vowed and the voluntary offerings, having been mentioned in ver. 21, the law as to the third form, thanksgiving offerings, is repeated from ch. vii. 15 (where see note).

Vers. 31—33.—These verses form the conclusion of the Section and of the Part, enjoining obedience to God's commandments, reverence for his Name, and consequent holiness.

## HOMILETICS.

Vers. 17—25.—*The perfection demanded in the sacrificial victims* contains a typical, a symbolical, and a moral lesson.

I. **THEY MUST BE PERFECT, THAT THEY MAY BE TYPES OF CHRIST.** The perfect Victim must not be represented by anything imperfect. There are but few points in which the perfection of Christ, both absolute and in relation to the work which as the appointed Victim he was to fulfil, could be foreshadowed by the animals offered in sacrifice, but this was one—that they should be without blemish and perfect of their kind. “The blood of Christ who through the Eternal Spirit offered himself *without spot to God*,” is the antitype, we are taught in the Epistle to the Hebrews, to “the blood of bulls, and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer, sprinkling the unclean,” which “sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh” (Heb. ix. 13, 14). For “ye know,” says St. Peter, “that ye were redeemed . . . with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb *without blemish and without spot*” (1 Pet. i. 18, 19); “who did no sin” (1 Pet. ii. 22); who “gave himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweetsmelling savour” (Eph. v. 2). The physical freedom from blemish on the part of the animal typifies the “spotlessness” of Christ.

II. **THEY MUST BE PERFECT, THAT THEY MAY SYMBOLIZE THE PERFECT HEART WITH WHICH ALL SERVICE MUST BE DONE TO GOD.** They symbolized the integrity of soul with which the offerer made his offering, and the purity of intention required of all who present themselves or anything that they do to God and his service. A gift to God is unacceptable, and not accepted, if there be in it *anything superfluous*, viz. self-display, or *anything lacking*, namely, the spirit of love. God chose those whom he afterwards called into his Church to “be holy and without blame (or blemish) before him in love” (Eph. i. 4), “that ye may stand perfect and complete in all the will of God” (Col. iv. 12), “that ye may be perfect and entire, wanting nothing” (Jas. i. 4). Imperfection must always mark man and his work, seeing that “the infection of nature doth remain, yea in them that are regenerated” (Art. IX.); but the Christian must not rest satisfied with aiming at anything but the highest. His purpose, however marred, must be to please God perfectly.

III. **THEY MUST BE PERFECT, BECAUSE WHAT WE GIVE TO GOD MUST BE COSTLY TO US.** “And the king said unto Araunah, Nay; but I will surely buy it of thee at a price: neither will I offer burnt offerings unto the Lord my God of that which doth cost me nothing. So David bought the threshingfloor and the oxen for fifty shekels of silver” (2 Sam. xxiv. 24). “And if ye offer the blind for sacrifice, is it not evil? and if ye offer the lame and sick, is it not evil? offer it now unto thy governor; will he be pleased with thee, or accept thy person? saith the Lord of hosts” (Mal. i. 8). “But cursed be the deceiver, which hath in his flock a male, and voweth, and sacrificeth unto the Lord a corrupt thing: for I am a great King, saith the Lord of hosts, and my Name is dreadful among the heathen” (Mal. i. 14). The cost of our gifts to God need not be absolutely great—the widow’s two mites, which make a farthing, may be more than all that the rich cast into the treasury (Mark xii. 41—44). Whatever we give, it must be of our best, the best effort of our intellect, the best affections of our hearts. Whatever we are most attached to, that we must be prepared to give up, if God demands the sacrifice at our hands.

## HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

Vers. 1—33.—*Holiness of priests and sacrifices.* While much that appertained only to a temporary dispensation, still great principles included in the formal regulations, as—

I. **RELIGION SANCTIFIES**, preserves, and perfects the whole humanity of man. 1. It preserves the true order—God first, the creature subject to the Creator. 2. It utilizes the central power of human nature, the moral and spiritual. The mind is the man, and the mind is not mere intellect, but moral consciousness and aspiration after God.

3. It puts the individual and the social in their true relation to that which supports both—the positive and public worship of God. The temple at Jerusalem represented the centre of the nation, Jehovah's throne. Humanity can be, will be, developed into a true family of nations only round the house of God. All non-religious influences are disintegrating to the nation and the world.

II. **THE LIFE OF MAN IS THE SANCTIFICATION OF ALL OTHER LIFE ON THE EARTH.** The lower natures depend on the higher. God has taught us by his Law not only to use them, but to reverence them and to hallow their instincts and the laws of nature as exhibited in them. Science may discover secrets, but it will not protect the weak. The reverence for that which is below us is even more a yielding up of our nature to the Spirit of God than the mere bowing prostrate before that which is above us. The selfishness and tyranny of the stronger over the weaker can only be cast out by religion.

III. **ALL LAW IS CONSISTENT WITH FREE AGENCY.** "At your own will." The true service of God is that which the heart renders. We blend our will with God's will in the acceptable life. At your will, but by the regulations of the Law. The mere capricious individualism of the present day is no true liberty, but becomes the most degrading bondage. The covenant relation of Jehovah with his people lay at the foundation of their obedience: "I hallow you," therefore hallow my commandments and my Name. In that loving bond of sanctification all believers find their strength. They are not their own, they are bought with a price. Paul rejoiced to be a "slave of Jesus Christ." The Jews made their Law unto death, not life, because they departed from its simplicity and forgot its spirituality, and "made the Word of God of none effect by their traditions," forging their own fetters. The key-note of the Law is redemption. "I am the Lord which brought you out of Egypt," etc. The key-note of redemption is love.—R.

*Priestly disqualifications.* Ch. xxii. ; cf. Matt. xxv. 31—46. We saw that inherited infirmity, such as is mentioned in *versa* 18—21 of last chapter, while it excludes from office, does not exclude from sustenance. We now come across a disqualification sufficient to exclude from both office and support, and this is *contracted defilement*. Any priest venturing before God with uncleanness upon him will be cut off from his presence. We are taught hereby—

I. **THAT IT IS CONTRACTED, NOT TRANSMITTED, DEFILEMENT WHICH NECESSITATES COMPLETE EXILE FROM JEHOVAH.** The priest's child providentially scarred or maimed, whose blemish has been from the womb, and in which he had no voluntary share, which excluded properly from *office*, is not excluded from sustenance from the altar; while, on the other hand, he who has through negligence or waywardness contracted defilement is, while it lasts, excluded altogether from the privileges of the priesthood.

The bearing of such an arrangement upon the question of *original sin* is plain on the least thought. The fact of original sin will not be questioned by any one who studies intelligently the question of heredity. Moreover, "representative responsibility," as a principle of providence, shows how we are held responsible for acts of others in which we have had no conscious share. At the same time, it is consolatory to think that transmitted evil will not of itself condemn its possessor to perpetual exile from God. When an infant dies, who has never been sufficiently advanced to contract any conscious defilement, who has never added to original sin any actual transgression, it is comforting to think that the righteous Governor will not exclude any such from the privilege of approaching him, but will purge away their inheritance of evil, and fit them for his everlasting fellowship. We believe in the salvation of the great multitude who die before coming to the years of discretion.

II. **CASUAL, AS DISTINGUISHED FROM PERMANENT, CONNECTION WITH THE PRIESTHOOD DISQUALIFIES A PERSON FROM PARTAKING OF THE THINGS OF THE ALTAR.** No mere casual guest, or even a hired servant of a priest's, was to eat of the holy things. If a servant had been purchased, and so became personally incorporated with the priestly family, he might eat of them. There is a corresponding casual and a corresponding permanent association with the Lord's work. Only those who enter on it with whole hearts, who dedicate themselves to it, body, soul, and spirit, need expect to participate in its privileges; while the mere casual associate will find himself excluded in the end.

III. THE SACRIFICES WERE TO BE AS UNBLEMISHED AS THE OFFICIATING PRIESTS; ANY PHYSICAL DEFECT DISQUALIFIED THEM FROM ACCEPTANCE. The unblemished character of the sacrifices teaches the same truth which we have already considered. As the sacrifices were practically substitutions, their perfection was to teach man not only that his Substitute must be perfect if God would accept him, but that he himself must be perfected, if he is to serve God in the great hereafter in a priestly spirit. At the same time, man is encouraged in the present state to offer what he can, even though it be not perfect. God does not insist on the absolute perfection of the work of his people. If it is willing (ver. 23)—if it is really a “freewill offering”—then God will accept it in the spirit in which it is given. The perfection is to be kept steadily in view as the ideal to which we must always be struggling; meanwhile, we are to be doing all we can with willing minds, even though our work is often poor at best.

IV. INHUMAN ACTS DISQUALIFY SACRIFICES OTHERWISE ACCEPTABLE. Thus a bullock, sheep, or goat, would not be acceptable till after the eighth day. It would have been inhuman to have denied it its week with its dam. Moreover, may not the seven days with the dam, like the seven days before the man-child's circumcision, represent a perfect period spent under parental care, and thus become an emblem of the providential use of the family institution?

Again, the dam and the young were not to be put to death on the same day. It has an inhuman appearance about it, like the scething of a kid in its mother's milk; and God arranged that the terms of the fifth commandment should be illustrated by, and not transgressed, even among the lower animals.

While, therefore, sacrificial worship entailed much suffering on the part of the innocent victims, there was a humane element to run through the service of the priests, and inhumanity would disqualify them from sacrificially serving God.—R. M. E.

Ver. 3.—*The service of abstention.* There were certain bodily conditions which, under the Levitical institutions, were suggestive of spiritual impurity, and those who suffered from them were accounted ceremonially unclean. Priests thus affected were disqualified for the ministry of the tabernacle, and were deprived, for a time, of sacerdotal privileges: they might not “go unto the holy things.” Any priest who was disobedient to this precept would be “cut off from the presence of the Lord.” To those who were thus unfortunate there was one service left,—the service of obedient abstention. They would be disappointed; they might feel somewhat humiliated; but there was left to them the opportunity of fulfilling the acceptable service of *offering not or eating not “unto the Lord”* (see Rom. xiv. 6).

It often happens to us that by some misfortune—perhaps, as here, some bodily affliction—we are disabled and detained from active service: it may be from (1) Christian work, or (2) public worship, or (3) daily duty (business or household activities). That which is unavoidable and for which we are not responsible may shut us out from many valued privileges. In this case we must render the service of abstention. We can—

I. SUBMIT IN PATIENCE.

II. BELIEVE WITH CHEERFUL CONFIDENCE: have faith to accept the truth that “they also serve who only stand and wait;” that God is as well pleased with the passive service of those whom he desires to “be still,” as with those who—

“ . . . at his bidding speed,  
And post o'er land and ocean without rest.”

III. WAIT IN HOPE. The hour will come, here or hereafter, sooner or later, when all bodily disabilities will have disappeared, and fullest access be given to the presence of the Lord.—C.

Vers. 10—15.—*The guilt of profanation.* That which had been offered in sacrifice was “holy unto the Lord;” these were “holy things” (ver. 10); “I the Lord do sanctify them” (ver. 16). They might only be partaken of by the priests and their families. Hence we have here a precise limitation of membership of the family; it included the returned daughter and the permanent servant, but did not include the hireling or the visitor, etc. We may note, in passing, (1) the regard which God paid (and still pays)

to the sanctity of family life, and our duty to guard it ; (2) the fact, on the other hand, that mere blood relationship does not suffice to secure the favour of God ; witness Nadab and Abihu. The son of the holiest minister of Christ may be a servant of the evil one, and an enemy of God. But the lesson of the text is—

I. THAT GOD WOULD HAVE US SEPARATE SOME THINGS FROM OTHERS WHICH WE MUST TREAT AS SACRED. “I the Lord do sanctify them” (ver. 16). That which is closely connected with himself is particularly “holy”—his Name, his truth, his worship ; also our own spiritual and immortal nature ; the world which is to come, etc.

II. THAT WE ARE UNDER SOME TEMPTATION TO DISREGARD HIS HOLY WILL. Forgetfulness, the spirit of levity and untimely humour, the contagiousness of human example, that tendency towards the formal and mechanical which belongs to our frail humanity,—these things will account for it. The forms which this irreverence or profanation takes are manifold : (1) taking in vain the holy Name of God, our Father, Saviour, Sanctifier ; (2) misuse of scriptural words—those especially which are of peculiar sacredness ; (3) irreverence in prayer or praise ; (4) the utterance of Divine truth by unhallowed, unappreciative lips ; (5) the partaking of the sacramental elements by those who are unreconciled to God ; (6) misappropriation of substance which has been dedicated to the service of Christ.

III. THAT MINISTERS OF CHRIST SHOULD BE SPECIALLY ON THEIR GUARD AGAINST THIS COMMON AND OFFENSIVE SIN. There are two reasons why those who minister in holy things should “watch and pray” against the commission of this wrong-doing. 1. They are under special temptation to commit it. Their very professional familiarity with the truth and service of God is likely to beget irreverence, utterance without feeling, action without inspiration. 2. Their example is more influential. Irreverence on the part of the minister is certain, in time if not immediately, to tell on the people. It will be communicated to them ; or, at the very least, it will seriously lessen and lower the impression which would otherwise be made on their hearts and lives.—C.

Vers. 17—30.—*Characteristics of acceptable service.* The very fact that all the points here referred to have been fully brought out before lends strong emphasis to them as matters of vital importance in the estimation of God. If our worship and service are to be acceptable, there must be—

I. SPONTANEITY OF SPIRIT. “Ye shall offer at your own will” (ver. 19) ; “when ye will offer . . . offer it at your own will” (ver. 29). There is a wilfulness in worship which is blamable (Col. ii. 23) ; but there is a willingness, a “cheerfulness in giving,” which is peculiarly acceptable unto God. The service which is rendered of necessity, under strong constraint and against the inclination of the spirit, has the least virtue, if, indeed, it have any at all. That which proceeds from a heart in fullest sympathy with the act, delighting to do the will of God (Ps. xl. 8), is well pleasing unto him.

II. COMPARATIVE EXCELLENCE. “Ye shall offer . . . a male without blemish, . . . whatsoever hath a blemish, that shall ye not offer : for it shall not be acceptable for you,” etc. (vers. 19—22). If the Hebrew worshipper brought that creature from flock or herd which, as being blemished, was least valuable, he did that which was offensive rather than acceptable. He put his Creator and Redeemer (ver. 33) in the second place, and his own material interests in the first place. He was to bring his best to the holiest. We, too, must avoid this fatal error—must rise to this spiritual height. We must not put off our Redeemer with that which we shall miss the least—in kind, in substance, in time ; we must bring to his altar the sweetness, the strength, and the beauty of all that we have to bring ; we must reserve the choice treasures for his hand of love. So far as may be in a world of imperfection, our offering to a Divine Saviour “shall be perfect to be accepted” (ver. 21).

III. REGARD FOR A SOLEMN PLEDGE. Absolute perfection, the positively whole and unblemished animal, might be difficult, or in some cases impossible, to secure. Hence some relaxation from the rule was allowed in the case of the free-will offering. But in the redemption of a vow no such departure was permitted (ver. 23). Any vow which was made unto God was considered to be in the last degree obligatory (Deut. xxiii. 21, 22 ; Eccles. v. 4, 5 ; Ps. lxxvi. 11). When “God’s vows are upon us,” when we stand pledged before him (1) to discharge certain functions, or (2) to abstain from

certain evils or perils, we should feel that we are bound with peculiarly strong bonds to make our sacrifice, of whatever kind it be, in its fulness and integrity.

IV. ABSENCE OF IMPURITY. (Ver. 20; see ch. vii. 15—18.)

V. PREFERENCE OF THE DIVINE WILL TO HUMAN GRATIFICATION. "Strangers" might bring their offerings to the house of the Lord. It was a pleasing and gratifying thing to witness the stranger bringing his bountiful tribute to the altar of Jehovah. It gratified the national feeling. But nothing might be accepted from the foreigner which was not worthy to be laid on the altar of the Holy One of Israel. His will to receive only unblemished offerings must outweigh their readiness or eagerness to receive outside testimony to the excellency of their institutions. We may be too eager to welcome the tribute of the stranger; we must require of him that he worship in sincerity and purity. The honour and the will of God should be more to us than the passing gratification we gain from any source whatever. Whatever we lose, he must be honoured and obeyed.—C.

Vers. 27, 28.—*The culture of kindness.* The words of the text remind us, by contrast, of two truths which are of value to us as disciples of Christ. 1. That the human spirit is never too young to be offered to God, whether (1) in parental devotion or (2) in self-dedication (ver. 27). 2. That two generations of the same family may offer themselves simultaneously to the service of God. Parent and child have not unfrequently made profession, in the same hour, of attachment to Christ, and have simultaneously "given themselves unto the Lord." But the main lesson to be learnt is *the culture of kindness*. This was the end of the Divine precept. There would be an apparent ruthlessness in taking away the young immediately from its dam, and also in slaying mother and offspring together on the same day. Therefore these acts must be avoided. Everything should be done to foster kindness of heart, considerateness of feeling, as well as justice, purity, righteousness of life. The culture of kindness is an act of piety. It is well to consider—

I. THE TWO SPHERES IN WHICH IT SHOULD BE EXHIBITED. 1. The human world: the home; the social circle; mankind at large. 2. The animal world. Everything that has life has feeling, and has a claim on our considerateness. We may add to its pleasure or may multiply its pain; may prolong or shorten life.

II. THE TWO MOTIVES BY WHICH WE SHOULD BE ACTUATED. 1. The inherent excellency of kindness. Unkindness is a shameful, shocking, deteriorating thing; kindness is intrinsically beautiful, admirable. 2. The will of God. These his laws (and see Deut. xxii. 6; xxv. 4) are an indication of his will; and we may be sure it is the will of him who creates and sustains sentient life that his human children should be kind to the dumb creatures of his thought and skill.

III. THE TWO SOURCES OF CULTIVATION. 1. That of our own minds. We must impress on ourselves that it is no less a tyrannical and cruel thing to use our great power to oppress the feeble creatures at our feet than it would be for others of vastly superior size and strength to our own to oppress and injure us. We must remind ourselves of those obvious considerations which will foster kind feelings and restrain from hurtful actions. 2. That of those who teach us. The parents and teachers of youth who do not inculcate kindness toward the feeble, whether of the animal or the human world, sadly neglect their duty to their charge. Young people may grow up ignorant of languages or sciences, and they may yet be admirable and useful men and women; but those who have not learnt to hate cruelty and to admire kindness will have a blot on their character which no attainments will hide.—C.

Vers. 1—16.—*The eating of the holy things.* We have seen, in the preceding chapter, that blemishes which precluded a priest from ministering at the altar did not hinder him from eating of the holy things. The ordinary Israelite, therefore, would not, by similar blemishes, be debarred from the privileges of his religion. There are, however, other things which would disqualify. These are now brought under our notice, together with the provisions by which they might be removed. Consider—

I. DISQUALIFICATIONS FOR EATING OF THE HOLY THINGS. 1. *With respect to priests.* (1) A priest would be disqualified by any uncleanness in his flesh; thus, if he were a leper. The reason is that leprosy was a notable emblem of sin. Or if he had any

running issue. Such things are in themselves loathsome, and evince a corrupt state of the body, and therefore fittingly represent moral corruption. This, under every dispensation, excludes men from that fellowship with God which was shadowed in the eating of the holy things. (2) He would be disqualified by contact with a human corpse, or with the carcase of any unclean animal. The moral lesson here is that “evil communications corrupt good manners,” that the “friendship of the world is enmity against God.” 2. *With respect to the families of priests.* (1) The stranger that sojourneth in Israel must become regularly proselyted to entitle him to the privileges of the Law. So those who would enjoy the corresponding spiritual privileges of the gospel must first become disciples of Jesus. (2) The hired servant in the family of a priest is not sufficiently incorporated in the family to entitle him to eat of the holy things. And there are servants of the gospel—persons who take a commendable interest in its outward prosperity—who yet are not of the “household of faith,” and have no experience of its spiritual mysteries. (3) The daughter of a priest, by marrying a stranger, forfeits her right to eat of the holy things. If now in her father’s house, she is simply a visitor, and has to be provided with common food. By yoking with the ungodly, the children of God forfeit his favour, and are only tolerated in the Church as visitors. 3. *These laws may not be invaded with impunity.* (1) If by accident they were transgressed, there was mercy for the offender when he made reparation. This was the original value, with a fifth part added (ver. 14). Paul obtained mercy for his sin against the gospel of Christ, “because he did it ignorantly in unbelief.” (2) For the wilful presumptuous transgression of the Law there was no mercy in its provisions. “That soul shall be cut off from my presence” (ver. 3). “They shall therefore keep mine ordinance, lest they bear sin for it, and die therefore, if they profane it” (ver. 9). There is a law of extremity also under the gospel (Matt. xii. 31, 32; Acts v. 1—11; Heb. vi. 4—6; x. 26—29; 1 John v. 16).

II. How THESE DISQUALIFICATIONS MAY BE REMOVED. 1. *In some cases by statute.* (1) Thus the servant of the high priest, bought with his money, though formerly an alien, is now so incorporated into his family that he may freely eat of the holy things. Being purchased, he is *permanently* under the power of the priest, and has no option to leave his service. So we, being redeemed by the blood of Christ and by a thorough repentance and conversion, renouncing all freedom to act against his will, may claim the privileges of his service. (2) Those born in the house of the priest, viz. to his slaves or permanent servants, are also reckoned as belonging to his family, and privileged to fare as his own children. This birth into the household expresses more than mere natural descent from a godly ancestry. The children of the covenant made with Abraham were not those naturally descended from him, but those who were also the children of his faith. Natural birth in a godly family now gives the initiation to goodness, but the privileges of the gospel can only be enjoyed by those who follow up their advantages. (3) The daughter of a priest, as we have seen, by marrying a stranger, forfeited her right to eat of the holy things. She was the figure of a back-slidder. But if there were no issue of the marriage, and her husband were dead, and she return to the house of her father as in her youth, she may again partake of the holy things. This teaches us God’s mercy to the wanderer from Christ who returns to him with a true conversion (see Luke xv. 11). 2. *In some cases by ordinance.* (1) If a man contract pollution by contact, he “shall not eat of the holy things, unless he wash his flesh with water” (vers. 4—6). As the baptism of *water* was necessary to qualify the *ceremonially* impure to eat of the holy things which were typical, so is the baptism of the *Holy Ghost* required to remove *moral* impurity, and give us the privilege of real fellowship with God (Heb. x. 22). (2) After this washing, “and when the sun is down, he shall be clean, and shall afterward eat of the holy things” (ver. 7). The *natural* or *civil* day began at sunrise; the *holy* day at sunset, viz. when nature is involved in the shadow of death. So it is in the turning from nature to grace that we enter into the privileges of fellowship with God.—J. A. M.

Vers. 17—33.—*Laws of the oblations.* These naturally follow those concerning the priests, which form the subject of the earlier portion of this chapter. They may be considered—

I. WITH RESPECT TO THE SACRIFICES. 1. *These must be the animals prescribed,*

(1) Clean creatures. To offer swine upon God's altar would be an outrageous insult to his purity. It would be figuratively equivalent to asking his acceptance and approval of passions and conduct the most filthy and loathsome. To attempt to foreshadow in the sacrifice of a hog the sacrifice of Christ would be against the most sacred propriety a horrible blasphemy. (2) Clean creatures of kinds specially selected by God. These are "of the beeves, of the sheep, or of the goats" (ver. 19). The roebuck and the hart are clean creatures, but not of the kinds selected, so, however they may be fitted to represent saints, viewed under particular aspects, they were too wild and intractable to be made fit emblems of Christ. 2. *They must be individuals without blemish.* (1) They must be free from disease. Therefore, if they have "scurvy," or a "wen," or a "running scab," which are symptoms of a diseased state of the blood, they are pronounced unfit. For disease is generally taken as an emblem of sin, and in this sense the reason should be understood, "because their corruption is in them" (ver. 25). (2) There must be no *natural* deformity, such as having any part too much extended, or, on the other hand, too much contracted. "We are shapen in iniquity." From our birth we are marred with moral deformities. But not so Jesus. He was in his birth the "holy thing." (3) They must have no *acquired* blemish—no blindness, lameness, fracture, or mutilation of any kind. By actual transgression we have fallen upon moral disasters. But Christ "fulfilled all righteousness," and must not be foreshadowed by any imperfect creature. (4) The same perfection was required in the sacrifice that was required in the priests. The best service and the best sacrifice should be given to the best Being (see Mal. i. 8, 12—14). The priest and the sacrifice were alike types of the same Lord Jesus, our Priest and Sacrifice. (5) But who is to judge of the fitness of the victim? The Jews say the sagan, or suffragan high priest, had to determine this. Now, Annas sustained that office under Caiaphas, and he accordingly sent Jesus bound to Caiaphas, viz. as a Sacrifice fit to be offered (see John xviii. 12—14, 24). The offerer also had to pass his judgment upon the creature he selects from his herd or flock. If Pilate be viewed as a representative person in this capacity, we hear him say, "I find no fault in this man." But God himself is the ultimate Judge; and has he not emphatically approved of Christ? (See Matt. iii. 17; xvii. 5; John xii. 28.) 3. *Blemished creatures may be given as free-will offerings.* (1) These were not prescribed in the Law, though permitted. They were things which piety might add to what was essential. They were not types of Christ, so they might be imperfect. (2) Piety will give to God the most perfect thing she possesses when she would acknowledge his worthiness to be honoured. But she would also express with humility the imperfection of her best services, and this she might do most appropriately in the offering of a blemished oblation. (3) But when the free-will offering is for a vow, then an imperfect thing will not be accepted. In this case the offering is prescribed in the Law because it is beyond the power of the offerer to retract (see Acts v. 4). And the sacrifice for a vow was a figure of Christ, who is pledged in the covenant of our redemption (see Ps. xxii. 25; xi. 6, 7).

II. WITH RESPECT TO THEIR OFFERING. 1. *They may not be offered till after the eighth day.* (1) For this there was a reason of humanity. The creature must remain "seven days under the dam." The Laws of God are framed to inculcate kindness and tenderness of heart. (2) It has also a reason of health. For the animal is scarcely formed in the first week of its life. Its hair and its hoofs are not grown. It is not wholesome food. (3) But the typical reasons are the more important. The "eighth day" was that upon which circumcision took place. The import of both rites, that of circumcision and that of sacrifice, is the same. Both represent the cutting off of the Holy Seed out of the land of the living, to secure the blessings of the covenant to men. The Jews say that the eighth day was specified so that a sabbath must be included, for that "the sabbath sanctifies all things." No doubt, when the great sabbath of the eighth day arrives, which is that of the new heavens and earth, all things in that state will be sanctified. That state will be the consummation of the blessings of the covenant. 2. *An animal and its young may not be killed the same day.* (1) This law respects fowls as well as larger creatures (see Deut. xxii. 6). It inculcates tenderness of heart. (2) But it has also a gospel import. It teaches that utter desolation is inconsistent with the idea of atonement. Life is spared because life is sacrificed. The death of Christ is vicarious; it is for the life of the world. 3. *It should be eaten the same day*

*on which it is killed.* (1) The moral here is that we must not delay to avail ourselves of the benefits of redemption in Christ. On the morrow (ver. 30) it may be too late. (2) On the third day it will be certainly too late (see ch. vii. 15; xix. 6, 7). The third day, or age, is that of our resurrection (see Hos. vi. 2). If we neglect salvation until then, it cannot be realized. Let us improve the opportunities of our probation. 4. *They should be offered devoutly.* (1) The Name of God must not be profaned. God's Name is hallowed by keeping his commandments (vers. 31, 32). The Name of God will be hallowed when his kingdom is come, for then his will shall be done upon earth as it is in heaven (Matt. vi. 9, 10). (2) He is to be recognized as our Redeemer. "I am the Lord which hallow you, that brought you out of the land of Egypt, to be your God." That redemption was only a figure of the great redemption through which God hallows his people in truth, of which also the oblations of the Law were figures. This is never to be forgotten.—J. A. M.

## PART IV.

### HOLY DAYS AND SEASONS: WEEKLY, MONTHLY, ANNUAL, SEPTENNIAL, AND EVERY HALF-CENTURY.

#### EXPOSITION.

##### CHAPTER XXIII.

THIS Part consists of chs. xxiii. and xxv., with ch. xxiv. parenthetically introduced.

Every religion must have its round of holy days and seasons: 1. To give occasion for manifesting joyous thankfulness to the Giver of all good things. 2. To keep alive the memory of past events around which religious associations cling. 3. To impress upon the hearts of the worshippers those sacred mysteries which are regarded as essential characteristics of the system.

1. The duty and happiness of rejoicing before the Lord find a prominent place under the Mosaic dispensation, as they must in any religion where man feels himself in a covenant relation with God, brought nigh to him by himself, and no longer estranged from him who is his only true life and happiness. Accordingly, the first thought of the annual Jewish festivals is that of joyous thankfulness, such as is becoming to reconciled children grateful to their Father for the many bounties that they receive at his hands. The first gift of God of which man becomes conscious is that of the daily sustenance provided for him, and therefore we should expect holy days to be appointed to commemorate the

goodness of God in bestowing the gifts of the earth. The first aspect, therefore, in which to regard the three great annual festivals—the Passover, Pentecost, and the Feast of Tabernacles—is that they were days of thanksgiving for the fruits of the earth dispensed by God to man.

First, with regard to the Passover. We read at vers. 10, 11, "*When ye be come into the land which I give unto you, and shall reap the harvest thereof, then ye shall bring a sheaf [or an omer] of the firstfruits of your harvest unto the priest: and he shall wave the sheaf before the Lord, to be accepted for you: on the morrow after the sabbath the priest shall wave it.*" The words, "the morrow after the sabbath," mean, as we shall see, the day after the first day of Unleavened Bread, that is, the second day of the feast, Nisan 16, which fell early in April, when the first barley was ripening in Palestine. On the 14th day of Nisan (the day of the Paschal sacrifice) a certain quantity of standing barley was marked off, by men specially appointed for the purpose, in a field ploughed the previous autumn and sown at least ten weeks before the Passover, but not prepared artificially in such a way as to hasten the crop. On the following day, Nisan 15, at sunset, three men were sent to the selected field, and, in

LEVITICUS.

z

the presence of witnesses, cut the ears of corn before marked, and brought them into the temple. On the next day, Nisan 16, this corn, whether in the form of a sheaf or of flour, was offered to the Lord by being waved before him, and then consigned to the priest. Here, by the presentation of the firstfruits of the year, an acknowledgment is made that the products of the earth are by right God's. This is one of the objects of the Feast of the Passover.

Secondly, as to Pentecost. After the sheaf, or omer, had been offered on Nisan 16, it was allowable to make the new year's barley into bread, but the dedication of the grain crops was not complete until a portion of the wheat crop had also been offered. This was done a week of weeks later, at the Feast of Pentecost, forty-nine days after the presentation of the barley, and fifty days after the first day of Unleavened Bread. On this day, two leavened loaves, of the same size as the shewbread loaves, were waved before the Lord, and then delivered to the priest. These loaves were made out of ears of corn selected and reaped as the barley had been seven weeks before, and then threshed and ground in the temple. They were regarded as the first-fruits of the wheat harvest, though they were not made of the first cut wheat; and from their presentation the festival has the name of the Feast of Harvest (Exod. xxiii. 16); the Feast of the Firstfruits of the Wheat Harvest (Exod. xxiv. 22); the Day of the Firstfruits (Numb. xxviii. 26); while, from its date relatively to the Passover, it is called the Feast of Weeks (Exod. xxxiv. 22; Deut. xvi. 10). The name, Feast of Pentecost, is found only in the Apocrypha (Tobit ii. 1; 2 Macc. xii. 32), and in the New Testament (Acts ii. 1; xx. 16; 1 Cor. xvi. 8). The meat offerings might not be made of the new year's flour until these two loaves had been offered.

Thirdly, with regard to the Feast of Tabernacles. The festivals connected with the seasons of the year and the products of the soil were not ended until the Feast of Ingathering (Exod. xxiii. 16; xxxiv. 22), or Tabernacles (ver. 34; Deut. xvi. 13; Ezra iii. 4; Zech. xiv. 16; Jer. vii. 2), had been celebrated. This festival occurred about the beginning of October, and com-

memorated the final gathering in of all the fruits of the year, specially of the olives and the grapes. It was observed by a general dwelling in booths made of the branches of palms, willows, olives, pines, myrtles, and other close-growing trees (ver. 40; Neh. viii. 15), in which all the Israelite males, with the exception of the sick, lived for seven days, and kept harvest home.

2. The second aspect in which to regard the annual festivals is the historical one. The *Passover* is characterized by its historical associations to a greater degree than either of the other festivals. The whole national life of the Israelites received its character from the Egyptian Exodus, and accordingly the anniversaries of their religious year began with its commemoration. It was the events which had taken place in Egypt which gave to the Paschal sacrifice and the Paschal feast their primary signification; and while to us the *Passover* festival serves as a proof of the truth of those events, to the Jew it served as a memorial of them, preventing them from ever being forgotten or disregarded (cf. Exod. xiii. 3-16). The ancient Christian Fathers suggested that the *Feast of Pentecost* commemorated the institution of the old dispensation at Sinai, as, to Christians, it recalled the institution of the new Law by the gift of the fiery tongues at Jerusalem. This suggestion was adopted by Maimonides and the later school of Hebrew commentators, and it is a very probable conjecture; but as no appearance of it is found in the Old or New Testaments, nor even in early Hebrew writers, it cannot be regarded as a certainty. Historically, the *Feast of Tabernacles* is generally considered to commemorate the dwelling in tents throughout the forty years' wandering in the wilderness; but if this were so, it would have been called the *Feast of Tents*, for the words "tent" and "tabernacle" differ, and the Israelites did not dwell in tabernacles in the wilderness. Rather, it commemorates the first encampment of the Israelites after setting forth from Egypt, which took place at "Succoth," the meaning of which word is "tabernacle" (Exod. xii. 37). Thus, as the event historically associated with the first harvest festival, the *Passover*, was the setting forth from Egypt, that associated with the last, the *Feast of*

Tabernacles, was the resting at the end of the first day's journey at Succoth, where the people now felt that they were free, and began to rejoice in their freedom.

3. The typical character of the feasts, as well as their historical character, is more apparent in the *Passover* than in the other two feasts. St. Paul's testimony on this point is sufficient: "For even Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us: therefore let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth" (1 Cor. v. 7). Here we have the typical character of the Paschal lamb, and of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, authoritatively declared to us. The blood of the lamb slain on the night before the Exodus, being the means whereby the Israelites were delivered from the destruction which fell on all the rest of the inhabitants of the land, typified the still more efficacious bloodshedding by which the redemption of Christ's people was wrought. The *Feast of Pentecost*, if it commemorated the gift of the Law at Mount Sinai, pointed thereby to the giving of the better Law on the day when the Holy Ghost descended upon the apostles in Jerusalem; and in any case, as a Feast of Firstfruits, it was emblematic of those first-fruits of the Christian Church presented to God on that day (Acts ii. 41). The *Feast of Tabernacles*, in which God's people commemorated their rejoicing in their newly found liberty after the slavery of Egypt, awaits its full typical fulfilment in the spiritual joy of the redeemed after they have been delivered from the burden of the flesh and the sufferings of the world; but its typical meaning is partially fulfilled in the blessed peace and joy spread abroad in the hearts of the children of God by reason of their adoption in Christ, whereby we have obtained an inheritance with the saints (Eph. i. 11, 18).

In the annual fast held on the 10th of Tisri, the great Day of Atonement, the typical element outweighs any other. The present and the past sink away in comparison with the future. The day suggests no thought of the seasons or of the products of the earth, and it recalls no event of past history. It teaches a lesson—the need of reconciliation; and by the entrance of the high priest into the holy of holies with sacri-

ficial blood, and by the ceremony of the scapegoat, it typically foreshadows how that reconciliation is to be effected.

The monthly festivals had a purpose different from the annual. They occurred on the new moon, or the first day of each month, and their intention was to dedicate each month to God. Only one of these monthly festivals is mentioned in this chapter—the Feast of Trumpets. It is the feast of the new moon of the sacred seventh month, with which the civil year began. Because it was New Year's Day, it had more ceremonies attached to it than the first days of the other months. Whereas the feasts of the new moons in other months only sanctified the special month which they began, the Feast of Trumpets sanctified also the whole year, and was therefore an annual as well as a monthly feast.

The weekly festival was the sabbath (see Exod. xx. 10; Deut. v. 15). This feast sanctified each week, as the monthly feasts sanctified each month; and like the annual festivals, it looked both backwards and forwards: backwards, to the sanctification bestowed upon it "Because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made" (Gen. ii. 3); forwards, to the great sabbath in which Christ rested in the grave, and yet further onwards to another sabbath still to be enjoyed by the people of God.

The sabbatical year and the jubilee were extensions of the sabbatical principle—certain civil and religious institutions and regulations being attached to each of them.

Vcr. 2.—Concerning the feasts of the Lord, which ye shall proclaim to be holy convocations, even these are my feasts. The translation should rather be, *The appointed times which ye shall proclaim to be holy convocations, these are my appointed times.* The appointed times (*mo'adim*) include the great fast as well as the festivals, and the weekly and monthly as well as the annual holy days. The primary purpose with which the following enumeration of holy days is introduced, is to give a list of the *holy convocations*. While the Israelites were still dwelling in the wilderness, a *holy convocation* appears to have been a religious assembly of all the males in the court of the tabernacle. After the settlement in Canaan, a religious gathering for prayer or festive rejoicing in *all their dwellings*, that is, wherever they lived, would have satisfied the command to hold

a holy convocation, except on the three great festivals, when all who could, "kept the feast" at Jerusalem. There were in all seven *holy convocations* in the year, besides the sabbath, namely, the first and last days of Unleavened Bread, the Feast of Pentecost, the Day of Atonement, the Feast of Trumpets, the first and last days of the Feast of Tabernacles.

Ver. 3.—*The seventh day is the sabbath of rest.* This is a very strong expression, literally, *the sabbath of sabbatism*, which doubles the force of the single word. *Ye shall do no work therein.* The sabbath and the Day of Atonement were the only days in which no work might be done, whereas on the other festivals it was only no servile work that might be done. It is not to be observed solely where the tabernacle is pitched or the temple is built, but in every town and village of Canaan—in all your dwellings. In the sanctuary itself the peculiar characteristics of the sabbath were a holy convocation, the renewal of the shewbread, and the burnt offering of two lambs with their meat and drink offerings (Numb. xxviii. 9, 10); elsewhere it was observed only by the holy convocation and rest from all labour. It commenced at sunset on Friday evening, and continued till sunset on Saturday evening. In later days the hour at which it began was announced by three blasts of the priests' trumpets, immediately after which a new course of priests entered on their ministry.

Ver. 4.—This verse repeats the statement or heading contained in ver. 2, with reference to the annual holy day, the sabbath having been disposed of in ver. 3.

Ver. 5.—*In the fourteenth day of the first month at even is the Lord's passover.* The month of Nisan was made the first month of the religious year in consequence of the original Passover having taken place in it (Exod. xii. 2). On the occasion of the first, or Egyptian, Passover, all heads of a family, either singly or two or three heads of families in conjunction, provided themselves with a lamb or a kid on the 10th day of Nisan, killed it in the evening of the 14th, and, taking a bunch of hyssop, dipped it in the blood and struck the lintel and two side posts of the doors of their houses with the blood. They then roasted the animal whole for eating, added to it unleavened bread, and garnished it with bitter herbs. They made themselves ready to eat it by dressing themselves for a journey, "with their loins girded, their shoes on their feet, and their staff in their hands" (Exod. xii. 11), and thus they ate it in haste, in a standing position. The meaning of the ceremony is explained by what was taking place at the same time. On the same night, after the

blood had been sprinkled upon the lintel and side posts, God slew the firstborn of all who had not exhibited this symbol of their having been brought into covenant with himself, and the Israelites set off hurriedly on their departure from Egypt. It was commanded that the day should be kept hereafter in like manner as a memorial, and that the following seven days should be kept as a Feast of Unleavened Bread (Exod. xii. 14, 15). This command is here concisely repeated, as it is again repeated in Deut. xvi. 1—8. One very considerable change was, however, necessarily made in the method of its observance. Originally, each head of a household or combination of households sacrificed the lamb himself, and sprinkled the blood upon the doorposts and lintel. But after the establishment of the Aaronic priesthood and the withdrawal of the priestly authority previously vested in each head of a house (chs. viii., ix.), and after the stringent prohibition of sacrificing elsewhere than in the court of the tabernacle had been issued (ch. xvii.), this could not continue. Accordingly, we find in the Book of Deuteronomy the direct injunction, "Thou mayest not sacrifice the Passover within any of thy gates, which the Lord thy God giveth thee: but at the place which the Lord thy God shall choose to place his Name in, there thou shalt sacrifice the Passover at even, at the going down of the sun, at the season that thou camest forth out of Egypt" (xvi. 5, 6). A result from this rule was that every male Israelite had to present himself at Jerusalem, and there slay his lamb on the day of the Passover, which in the time of Nero, brought between two and three million pilgrims to Jerusalem each year. The crowd of pilgrims took their way to the temple, and were admitted into the court in three divisions. There they slew each man his lamb, while the priests offered the blood on the altar, and the Levites sang the Hallel (Ps. cxlii.—cxviii.). Then they bore away the lambs, roasted them whole on a spit of pomegranate wood, taking care that no bone should be broken, and prepared the Paschal supper. At the supper, as well as at the sacrifice, a change of manner was introduced. "As the guests gathered round the Paschal table, they came no longer, as at the first celebration, with their loins girded, with shoes on their feet, and a staff in their hands; that is, as travellers waiting to take their departure. On the contrary, they were arrayed in their best festive garments, joyous and at rest, as became the children of a king. To express this idea, the rabbis also insisted that the Paschal supper, or at least part of it, must be eaten in that recumbent position with which we are familiar from the New

Testament. 'For,' say they, 'they use this leaning posture, as free men do, in memorial of their freedom.' And again, 'Because it is the manner of slaves to eat standing, therefore now they eat sitting and leaning, in order to show that they have been delivered from bondage into freedom.' And finally, 'No, not the poorest in Israel may eat till he has sat down, leaning.' But though it was deemed desirable to sit leaning during the whole Paschal supper, it was only absolutely enjoined while partaking of the bread and the wine" (Edersheim, 'Temple Service'). The essentials of the Paschal feast were the Paschal lamb, the unleavened bread, and the bitter herbs (Exod. xii. 8). To these were afterwards added a dish formed from an animal sacrificed on the Passover day, a composition of dates and other dried fruits, and four cups of red wine mixed with water, the last of which came to be regarded as essential as that which had been commanded in the Law. The Rabbi Gamaliel is reported by the Mishna to have said, "Whoever fails to explain three things in the Passover fails to fulfil his duty. These are the Paschal lamb, the unleavened bread, and the bitter herbs. The Paschal lamb means that God passed over the houses of our fathers in Egypt, which were sprinkled with blood; the unleavened bread, that our fathers were hurried out of Egypt; the bitter herbs, that the Egyptians made the lives of our fathers in Egypt bitter" (Pea. x. 15). The wine was regarded so necessary an adjunct, that it is ordered that every householder must provide himself with four cups, even if he had to sell or pawn his coat, or hire himself out for a servant, or receive money from the poor's box, in order to do so (Pea. i.). The supper began with drinking the first cup of wine, before which a grace, or thanksgiving, of the following character was said:—"Blessed art thou, Jehovah our God, who hast created the fruit of the vine! Blessed art thou, Jehovah our God, King of the universe, who hast chosen us from among all people, and exalted us from among all languages, and sanctified

us with thy commandments! And thou hast given us, in love, the solemn days for joy, and the festivals and appointed seasons for gladness, and this, the day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, the season of our freedom, a holy convocation, the memorial of our departure from Egypt. For us hast thou chosen; and us hast thou sanctified from among all nations, and thy holy festivals with joy and with gladness hast thou caused us to inherit. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who sanctifiest Israel and the appointed seasons! Blessed art thou, Lord, King of the universe, who hast preserved us alive, and sustained us, and brought us to this season" (Edersheim, 'Temple Service'). After drinking the first cup, there followed a general washing of hands, after which the company ate some of the bitter herbs. Then the second cup was filled, and in order to carry out the injunction of Exod. xii. 26, 27, the youngest member of the company inquired, "What mean ye by this service?" And the president of the feast replied, "It is the sacrifice of the Lord's Passover, who passed over the houses of the children of Israel in Egypt, when he smote the Egyptians, and delivered our houses." At the same time, he explained the purport of the unleavened bread and the bitter herbs, and called upon the company to give thanks for what God had wrought for them and for their fathers, ending with Ps. cxiii., cxiv., sung by all present. The second cup was then drunk, and after a second washing of hands, the unleavened bread was broken, and thanks again given, after which the pieces of bread, the bitter herbs, the other sacrificial dish (if any), and the Paschal lamb were partaken of in turn. The third cup was then filled, thanks were again given, and the cup was drunk. This cup had the name of the "cup of blessing," owing to the blessing said over it, and it was succeeded after an interval by the fourth cup, when Ps. cxv.—cxviii. (which, with Ps. cxiii., cxiv., made up the Hallel) were sung, followed by a prayer of thanksgiving.

#### HOMILETICS.

Ver. 5.—*The Paschal supper was observed by our Lord in obedience to the command in Exod. xii. 14; ch. xxiii. 5; Deut. xvi. 1—8, in the following manner, so far as we are able to gather from the narrative of the gospel.*

I. **HE SENT PETER AND JOHN BEFOREHAND TO PREPARE THE PASSOVER.** The first step in the preparation of the Passover was the purchase of the Paschal lamb. We may see the two disciples, after they had been led by the man bearing a pitcher of water to the house where the feast was to be held, providing themselves with a lamb, unleavened bread, the bitter herbs, and that other dish into which the sop was afterwards dipped; then carrying the lamb to the temple, to be sacrificed in the court. This

was on the afternoon of Nisan 14. Admitted into the court of the temple, in one or other of the three divisions into which the mass of the pilgrims and residents were divided, they would have slain the lamb, and, after the blood had been thrown on the altar by the priests, they would have carried the body to the house in which the preparations for the Master's eating the Passover were being made.

II. HE SELECTED HIS PASCHAL COMPANY. The rule was that the company should not consist of less than ten persons. In the present case it amounted to thirteen. Around him were gathered his twelve disciples, with whom "he desired with desire to eat the Passover before he suffered" (Luke xxii. 15).

III. HE ENTERED INTO JERUSALEM IN ORDER THAT HE MIGHT EAT THE PASSOVER IN THE PLACE WHICH THE LORD HAD CHOSEN. (Deut. xvi. 7.) "It was probably as the sun was beginning to decline in the horizon that Jesus and the other ten disciples descended once more over the Mount of Olives into the holy city. Before them lay Jerusalem in her festive attire. All around pilgrims were hastening towards it. White tents dotted the sward, gay with the bright flowers of early spring, or poured out from the gardens and the darker foliage of the olive plantations. From the gorgeous temple buildings, dazzling in their snow-white marble and gold, on which the slanting rays of the sun were reflected, rose the smoke of the altar of burnt offering. These courts were now crowded with eager worshippers, offering for the last time, in a real sense, their Paschal lambs. The streets must have been thronged with strangers, and the flat roofs covered with eager gazers, who either feasted their eyes with a first sight of the sacred city for which they had so often longed, or else once more rejoiced in view of the well-remembered localities. It was the last day view which the Lord had of the holy city till his resurrection. Only once more in the approaching night of his betrayal was he to look upon it in the pale light of the full moon. He was going forward to 'accomplish his death' in Jerusalem; to fulfil type and prophecy, and to offer himself up as the true Passover Lamb—'the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world.' They who followed him were busy with many thoughts. They knew that terrible events awaited them, and they had only a few days before been told that these glorious temple buildings, to which, with a national pride not unnatural, they had directed the attention of their Master, were to become desolate, not one stone being left upon the other. Among them, revolving his dark plans and goaded on by the great enemy, moved the betrayer. And now they were within the city. Its temple, its royal bridge, its splendid palaces, its busy marts, its streets filled with festive pilgrims, were well known to them as they made their way to the house where the guest-chamber had been prepared for them" (Edersheim, 'Temple Service').

IV. HE ATE THE PASSOVER MEAL IN THE CUSTOMARY MANNER, YET WITH SUCH ALTERATIONS AS MADE IT A NEW INSTITUTION. For example: 1. He began with the first cup, over which he gave thanks as usual, and then gave it to the company to drink. It is of this cup that we read in St. Luke, "And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, Take this, and divide it among yourselves" (xxii. 17). 2. Instead of the first washing of hands, he "began to wash the disciples' feet, and to wipe them with the towel wherewith he was girded" (John xiii. 5). 3. The feast then continued in its usual order. The second cup, the unleavened bread (part of which was "the sop" given to Judas), the bitter herbs, and the eating of the lamb followed in order. 4. The Lord then took some of the unleavened bread, and when he had given thanks over it, or blessed it, he brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, "Take, eat, this is my body" (Matt. xxvi. 26; Luke xxii. 19; 1 Cor. xi. 24). 5. He took the third cup, called "the cup of blessing" (cf. 1 Cor. x. 16), "and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins" (Matt. xxvi. 27, 28; Mark xiv. 23, 24; Luke xxii. 20; 1 Cor. xi. 25). 6. The fourth cup, accompanied by the "hymn," or Hallel (Matt. xxvi. 30; Mark xiv. 26), no doubt finished the supper in the usual manner.

V. THE PASCHAL SUPPER THUS CEASED FOR EVER, AND THE LORD'S SUPPER WAS INSTITUTED IN ITS PLACE. The blood of the original lambs slain in Egypt received its efficacy in covering the people of Israel and delivering them from the visitation of God's angel of wrath, by its anticipatory representation of the blood of the true Lamb of God, which was shed for the deliverance of God's redeemed upon the cross. The

time had now come for that blood to be shed, and therefore the memorial and typical sacrifices offered year by year necessarily ceased, the shadow being swallowed up in the substance, the type in the antitype. In like manner, the feast on the body of the lamb, which represented the body of Christ, necessarily ceased when there was no longer a lamb to be sacrificed. The Paschal feast, if continued longer, would have been an unmeaning form, because its meaning had become exhausted.

Yet, just as Christianity grew by God's will out of Judaism, so a new memorial of Christ sprang out of the old type. He took the bread that was before him, an accessory of the old feast, and consecrated it, together with the third cup, to represent his body and blood in the future, for a memorial, just as the body of the lamb which was eaten and the blood of the lamb that was shed had typically and by anticipation represented them in the past. Thus the dead wood of the old form, at the moment of perishing blossomed into new life.

The Passover was to be kept as "a feast to the Lord throughout your generations; ye shall keep it a feast by an ordinance for ever" (Exod. xii. 14); and any one who did not keep the feast was to "be cut off from Israel" (Exod. xii. 15). In like manner, the Lord's Supper is to continue, the bread is to be eaten and the cup to be drunk, as the means of showing forth the Lord's death "till he come." The one ordinance is of as permanent a nature as the other, and the neglect of it may cause people to incur a no less penalty in the second case than in the first.

#### HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

*The offering of rest: the sabbath.* Ch. xxiii. 1—3; cf. Gen. ii. 2, 3; Exod. xvi. 22; xx. 8—11; Mark ii. 23—28; Rev. i. 10. In the sacrificial worship we come across what is essentially different as an offering from the sacrifice of an animal or of any palpable possession, and yet is a real sacrifice all the while—we mean that of *time*. The sabbath, as an offering of rest, has consequently a very high place among the Jews. As Ewald has remarked, it is the only sacrifice which finds a place among the ten commandments. No wonder he regards it as "the greatest and most prolific thought" in the Jewish religion. And here let us notice—

I. **THE HIGH VALUE MAN USUALLY SETS ON HIS TIME.** It is indeed said to be money. Many will make almost any other sacrifice more willingly than that of their time. They will give money, valuables, almost anything you like to ask, except their precious time. What a fuss made about an evening devoted to you by a busy friend, or half an evening, or sometimes half an hour!

Hence, in demanding from man a proportion of his time, God asks for what man esteems highly and is loth to give. Time is regarded as so peculiarly man's own, to do what he likes in, that it becomes no light sacrifice, but rather the crown of all sacrifices, when a considerable portion of time is made over unto God.

II. **THE DEMAND GOD MAKES IS IN MAN'S INTEREST, FOR IT IS FOR REST AFTER LABOUR.** Six days of work, and then, saith God, one day of rest. The body needs it. Seven days' unceasing toil would soon take the heart out of all workers, and bring on premature decay. God himself has set the example. After the untold labours of the creation, after the hard work—if we may reverently use such terms of God—of the creative periods, he has entered into the long sabbath of human history. He is in the midst of it now. This is implied by the words of Jesus, "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work" (John v. 17), in their connection. And so a restful Father in heaven calls upon his toiling children upon earth to rest, as he has done, one day out of seven, and not sink through unceasing labour. So consonant is this weekly rest with the laws of our physical nature, that some, who do not see clearly the scriptural proof and obligation of a holy day, believe that it might safely be allowed to rest upon the foundation of physical need. But the needs of others, alas! constitute no sufficient sanction with selfish men. God must speak and make his demand, else men will run counter to their general welfare in their self-indulgence.

III. **GOD'S REST IS TO BE CHARACTERIZED BY SOCIAL WORSHIP.** Man is not to spend his seventh day in inactivity. He is not to loiter about his tent or gossip at its door all the day. There is to be "an holy convocation" (בְּמִזְבֵּחַ). The day is to be

celebrated by social worship. The people were expected to gather in their thousands to praise the Lord. Were it not for such a regulation as the sabbath, with its public services, even Judaism could not have survived.

The same reason still holds for a holy sabbath. In the interests of religion it must be observed. What would become of our holy religion if a set time for its weekly observance were not generally kept? Men need these "trysting times" and "trysting places" (as *תָּמִים*, in ver. 2, might very properly be translated), that religion may keep its position among us.

We may imagine what our land would be if no Lord's day were kept, if no sabbath bells summoned people to public prayer, and no preachers got their weekly opportunities. It would soon be an irreligious land, carelessness and indifference reigning throughout it in a measure infinitely greater than they do even now.

IV. THE DAY OF REST IS TO BE REGARDED AS THE LORD'S. "It is the sabbath of the Lord in all your dwellings." The Jew regarded the sabbath as "the Lord's day." It was the day of the week that God regulated, and all whose hours he claimed as his. We claim as much for "the first day of the week" under our dispensation. We ask men to lay the day as a hearty offering on God's altar. They are not doing so while they spend it as they like. It is to be a holy day, not a holiday; a holy day, and therefore to a holy soul a happy day, the day in which we can rejoice and be glad. When we can say with John, "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day," we are sure to have most precious visions of the Lord's beauty and glory (cf. Rev. i. 10, etc.).

It is no contention, therefore, about something Jewish, but simply about something honestly dedicated as a day to God. Those who contend against the strict observance of the Lord's day either labour under a total misapprehension about the way some people spend it, or are really bent upon devoting the day to their own purposes instead of to God's. If we are commonly honest, we shall esteem it only right to surrender as the highest offering of our religious life the seventh of our time to him who deserves it all.

"Man, then," says Ewald, "shall release his soul and body from all their burdens, with all the professions and pursuits of ordinary life, only in order to gather himself together again in God with greater purity and fewer disturbing elements, and renew in him the might of his own better powers. If, then, the interchange of activity and rest is already founded in the nature of all creation, and is the more beneficial and health-bringing the more regular its recurrence, so should it be found here too; yet not as when, in the night and in sleep, the body is cared for, but as when, in a joyous day of unfettered meditation, the spiritual man always finds his true rest, and thereby is indeed renewed and strengthened."—R. M. E.

Vers. 1-3.—*The sabbath.* This is here classed amongst the "feasts of the Lord." The greater number of these were first observed after the settlement of the Israelites in Canaan; but the Passover was an exception, which was held at the time of the Exodus, forty years earlier. The sabbath also was an exception. We have to consider—

I. THE OBLIGATION OF THE SABBATH. 1. *It is not altogether a Mosaic institution.* (1) Its original enactment took place at the close of the creation week. The words are these (see Gen. ii. 1-3). (2) It was, therefore, an Adamic law, and was obligatory upon mankind at large more than twenty centuries before the Israelites had an existence. (3) It was by the Israelites themselves recognized as a patriarchal law. For, in the wilderness of Sin, probably three months before they were fully constituted into a nation by receiving their own Law at Sinai, the double portion of manna which they gathered on the sixth day had respect to the sabbath to follow on the seventh (see Exod. xvi. 22-30). 2. *It was incorporated in the Sinai code.* (1) It formed the fourth commandment of the Decalogue (Exod. xx. 8-11). But even here it is introduced with the word "Remember," as a law already known to exist. The reason for its observance also is that given at the original institution. (2) As a Levitical law, however, it has an additional reason, viz. the deliverance of the children of Israel from the cruel servitude in Egypt, where they could not enjoy the rest of the ancient institution (Deut. v. 15; see also Heb. iv. 8, margin). (3) In this relation also *death* was made the penalty of its transgression (see Exod. xxxi. 13-15; Numb. xv. 32-36). 3. *The Levitical law of the sabbath is repealed.* (1) The body is of Christ, who fulfilled

the type of the deliverance from the bondage of Egypt in emancipating us from the bondage of sin. (2) The Levitical penalty of death for the transgression of the Law is, of course, removed with the obligation of the Law itself. 4. *But the Adamic law remains.* (1) As Gentiles, we were never under the Levitical Law. The institution of the Levitical sabbath, or the incorporation of the patriarchal sabbath in the Mosaic code, left us still where we were, under the Adamic law. (2) And as the enactment of the Mosaic Law, which mainly concerned the Hebrew people and their land, left us where we were, so do we remain there after the abrogation of the Mosaic Law. (3) But what effect has that abrogation upon the Hebrew? It leaves him where he was before the publication of his Law, viz. in common with mankind at large, still under obligation to observe and keep the sabbath of the Adamic law. (4) This reasoning is equally good, whether we identify the sabbatic law as set out in the Decalogue with the Adamic law on the one hand, or with the Levitical on the other.

II. HOW IT SHOULD BE KEPT. It should be kept: 1. *As a day of rest from business.* (1) The idea of rest is expressed in its name. It was the most obvious idea in the injunction from the beginning. God *hallowed* it, or separated it from the six days of the week, because on the seventh day he rested from the work of the creation. (2) The *rest* of God does not imply that he was weary from his work, but that he ceased from the action of creating. This is the import of the word (*מִשְׁבֵּת*). The teaching is that God so constituted his creation that his active creatures need a hebdomadal pause or rest. (3) To ensure this to them he mercifully constituted it into a law. He foresaw that otherwise it would be refused under the influence of cupidity, avarice, tyranny, and stupidity. 2. *As a day of holy convocation.* (1) Rest being secured from the toil of business, the activities of the soul have now to be turned into another course. *Change* really constitutes the *rest* of an essentially active nature. So the *rest* of God from creation is his *work* in providence and redemption. This our Lord taught us when he said, "My Father worketh hitherto," or *until now* (*τως οποια*) (John v. 16, 17; comp. Ps. xxxi. 19). (2) That change which is the greatest from the activities of business is communion with God in his worship and service. This seems to have constituted the *blessing* of the seventh day, for on that day God visited his children in Eden. Ever since it has been the season sacred to religious services. (3) Men must not be diverted from this noblest of pursuits by seeking their own pleasure on the sabbath day (Isa. lviii. 13). 3. *As a day of prophetic anticipation.* (1) Barnabas (in his Epistola, cap. xv.) puts this subject thus: "Attend, my children, to what he says, 'finished in six days'—that is to say, in six thousand years the Lord God will consummate all things, for with him the day is a thousand years, as he himself testifies, saying, 'Behold, this day shall be as a thousand years.' Therefore, children, in six days—that is, in six thousand years—all things shall be consummated. *And he rested the seventh day*, that is, when his Son shall come and make an end of the time of the wicked one, and shall judge the ungodly, and shall change the sun, and moon, and stars; then shall he rest gloriously in the seventh day." (2) These views seem to be in harmony with the sacred calendar of prophecy. And Paul in particular refers to the "*sabbath-keeping* which remaineth for the people of God" (Heb. iv.).—J. A. M.

Ver. 3.—*Aspects of the sabbath.* We are reminded of—

I. ITS ORIGIN IN EARLIEST HUMAN HISTORY. "The seventh day is the sabbath of rest" (see Gen. ii, 2, 3).

II. THE SPECIAL OBLIGATION RESTING ON ISRAEL, AS A REDEEMED PEOPLE, TO OBSERVE IT. "The Lord thy God brought thee out thence . . . therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the sabbath day" (Deut. v. 15). We, also, as those redeemed at far greater cost, may feel ourselves on this ground constrained to observe it.

III. ITS PLACE IN THE PROPHETIC TESTIMONY. It is deeply significant that the prophets, who were the rebukers of mere ritualism and the advocates of the moral and spiritual elements in religion, should have given so high a place as they did to the observance of the sabbath (see Isa. i. 10—15, comp. with lvi. 2 and lviii. 13, 14).

IV. ITS CHRISTIAN ASPECT. 1. It commemorates the greatest fact in human history—the resurrection of our Lord. The crowning act of redemption is more to us than the crowning act of creation. 2. Its obligation rests not on any one positive precept, but on the known will of Christ. 3. It meets the two great wants of man—his bodily and his

spiritual requirements. 4. It is to be observed: (1) in the Church,—it is to be “an holy convocation;” (2) in the home,—“in all your dwellings.” As individual souls we shall seek to honour our Lord and gain access of spiritual strength in the sanctuary; as parents we shall do our best to make the sabbath a holy, happy, welcome day to the children in our homes.—C.

### EXPOSITION.

Ver. 8.—The Feast of Unleavened Bread was instituted at the same time with the Feast of the Passover (Exod. xii. 15—17), and from the beginning the two festivals were practically but one festival, never separated, though separable in idea. The Passover, strictly so called, lasted but one day, Nisan 14; the Feast of Unleavened Bread lasted seven days, Nisan 15—21. The whole made a festival of eight days, called indifferently the Feast of the Passover, or the Feast of Unleavened Bread. The bread to be eaten throughout the festival was unleavened, in order to remind the Israelites of the historical fact that on account of the urgency of the Egyptians, “the people took their dough before it was leavened, their kneadingtroughs being bound up in their clothes upon their shoulders” (Exod. xii. 34), and quitted the land of their affliction in haste. Accordingly, in the Book of Deuteronomy it is appointed, “Seven days shalt thou eat unleavened bread therewith, even the bread of affliction; for thou camest forth out of the land of Egypt in haste: that thou mayest remember the day when thou camest forth out of the land of Egypt all the days of thy life” (Deut. xvi. 3).

Vers. 7, 8.—The first and the last day were to be days of holy convocation, on which no servile work might be done. It was on the first day, Nisan 15, that our Lord was crucified. The Pharisees found nothing in the holiness of the day to prevent their taking virtual part in his seizure and condemnation and death; but we are told by St. John that “they themselves went not into the judgment hall, lest they should be defiled, but that they might eat the Passover” (John xviii. 28). What is meant in this passage by “the Passover” is not the Paschal lamb which had already been consumed, but probably the peace offering, or *chagigah*, which had to be offered and eaten on the first day of Unleavened Bread. The public sacrifices on each of the seven days of the week were two young bullocks, one ram, and seven lambs for a burnt offering,

with the accompanying meat offerings, and one goat for a sin offering (Numb. xxviii. 19—24). And these were followed by peace offerings made at the discretion of individuals, “according to the blessing of the Lord which he had given them” (Deut. xvi. 17).

Vers. 9—14.—A second command is given on the subject of the Feast of Unleavened Bread respecting those ceremonies which were only to be made use of when the Israelites had reached Canaan. It has reference to the second day of Unleavened Bread, which is called the morrow after the sabbath, the first day of the feast being meant by the sabbath, on whatever day of week it may have occurred. It was on this second day that the presentation of the first or wave sheaf of barley took place, according to the command, *Ye shall bring a sheaf of the firstfruits of your harvest unto the priest: and he shall wave the sheaf before the Lord, to be accepted for you: on the morrow after the sabbath the priest shall wave it.* Which command was fulfilled in the following manner. “Already, on the 14th of Nisan, the spot whence the first sheaf was to be reaped had been marked out by delegates from the Sanhedrim, by tying together in bundles, while still standing, the barley that was to be cut down. Though for obvious reasons it was customary to choose for the purpose the sheltered Ashes valley across Kedron, there was no restriction on that point, provided the barley had grown in an ordinary field—of course in Palestine itself—and not in garden or orchard land, and that the soil had not been manured nor yet artificially watered. When the time for cutting the sheaf had arrived, that is, on the evening of the 15th of Nisan (even though it was a sabbath) just as the sun went down, three men, each with a sickle and basket, formally set to work. But in order clearly to bring out all that was distinctive in the ceremony, they first asked of the bystanders three times each of these questions: ‘Has the sun gone down?’ ‘With this sickle?’ ‘Into this basket?’ ‘On this sabbath?’ (or first Passover day); and lastly, ‘Shall I reap?’ Having been each time answered in the affirmative, they cut down barley to the amount of one ephah, or ten omers, or three seahs, which is

equal to about three pecks and three pints of our English measure. The ears were brought into the court of the temple" (Edersheim, 'Temple Service'). The sheaf composed of these ears (for the Authorized Version is right in considering that it is the sheaf, and not the omer of flour made out of the ears of barley, that is meant by 'wy, though Josephus and the Mishna take it the other way) was on the following day waved by the priests before the Lord, in token of its consecration, and through it, of the consecration of the whole barley crop to the Lord. With it was offered the burnt offering of a lamb, a meat offering double the usual quantity, and a drink offering. This passage and veras. 18 and 37, are the only places in the Book of Leviticus where the drink offering is mentioned. Until the waving of the sheaf, neither bread nor parched corn, nor green ears, that is, no grain in any form, might be eaten. We may imagine how delicacies made of the new flour would at once appear in the streets as soon as the sheaf had been waved.

Vers. 15—21.—The Feast of Pentecost lasted but one day. From the morrow after the sabbath—that is, from the second day of Unleavened Bread—the day that ye brought the sheaf of the wave offering; seven sabbaths, i.e. weeks, were to be counted, making forty-nine days, and on the day following the completion of the seventh sabbath (meaning here the seventh week), the festival was to be held, whence its later name of Pentecost, or Fiftieth-day Feast. It would have fallen about the beginning of June—a season of the year which would have made the journey to Jerusalem easy. The characteristic offering of the day was that of two wave loaves of two tenth deals . . . of fine flour . . . baken with leaven. These loaves were regarded as the firstfruits unto the Lord of the wheat harvest, although the greater part of the crop had now been reaped and housed. They were to be leavened and brought out of your habitations; that is, they were to consist of such bread as was ordinarily used in daily life. They were made out of ears of wheat selected and cut like the barley in the Feast of Unleavened Bread, and then threshed and ground in the temple court. Each loaf contained an omer of flour, amounting to about five pints, and would therefore have weighed about five pounds. With these were offered two lambs, which were waved before the Lord by being led backwards and forwards before the tabernacle or the temple, and then the loaves were waved also, but they were not placed upon the altar, as they were leavened. The twentieth verse, which is somewhat obscure in the

Authorized Version, should be punctuated as follows. And the priest shall wave them (the two lambs) with the bread of the first-fruits (the two loaves) for a wave offering before the Lord; with the two lambs they (the loaves) shall be holy to the Lord for the priest. The other sacrifices to be offered on this day are described in the text as seven lambs, . . . one young bullock, and two rams . . . for a burnt offering unto the Lord, with their meat offering, and their drink offerings, . . . and one kid of the goats for a sin offering. In the Book of Numbers (xxviii. 27) they are stated to be "seven lambs," "two young bullocks," "one ram," with meat and drink offerings, and "one kid of the goats." Seeing that in Leviticus *one young bullock and two rams* are commanded, and in Numbers "two young bullocks and one ram," it is reasonable to suppose that a copyist's error has found its way into one or the other text. The feast was to be kept as a day of holy convocation, and no servile work was to be done upon it. The number of sacrifices offered by individuals who had come to Jerusalem caused the festivity to be in practice continued for several days subsequent to the festival itself.

Ver. 22.—When ye reap the harvest of your land. The legislator pauses in his enunciation of the festivals to add the rule of charity, already laid down in the nineteenth chapter, as to leaving the gleanings unto the poor, and to the stranger.

Vers. 23—25.—In the seventh month, in the first day of the month. Only one of the monthly festivals is named in this chapter, because it is the only one on which a holy convocation was to be held. The first day of the seventh month we should expect to be holier than the first day of any other month, on account of the peculiar holiness of the seventh month, and because it was the beginning of the civil year. It is to be a sabbath; that is, a festival observed by rest, and a memorial of blowing of trumpets. The latter words should be rather rendered a *memorial of a joyful noise*. That these joyful sounds were made by blowing the cornet, we may well believe from the testimony of tradition, but the text of Holy Scripture does not state the fact, and the use of the word *trumpets* in place of "cornets" leads to a confusion. Every new moon, and among them that of the seventh month, was observed by the blowing of trumpets (Numb. x. 10), but the trumpets then blown differed in their use and shape from the cornet. The trumpet was a long-shaped, metal instrument, at first used to give the signal for marching, afterwards to serve as the sign of the arrival of the monthly festival; the cornet was an animal's horn, or, if not a real

horn, an instrument formed in the shape of a horn, and it was used to express joyful emotions, answering somewhat to our modern bell-ringing in the West, or firing unloaded guns in the East. Besides the blowing of trumpets, special sacrifices were appointed for the first of each month, "two young bullocks, and one ram, seven lambs," with their meat and drink offerings, for a burnt offering, and "one kid of the goats" for a sin offering (Numb. xxviii. 11—15). On New Year's Day, which, from its difference from the other new moons, was an annual as well as a monthly feast, the special offerings were "one young bullock, one ram, and seven lambs," with their meat and drink offerings for a burnt offering, and "one kid of the goats" for a sin offering; and these were to be in addition to the offerings made on the first day of each month (Numb. xxix. 2—6). It became a custom for the Levites to chant at the morning sacrifice Ps. lxxxi., and at the evening sacrifice Ps. xxix. The great joyfulness of the day is shown by the account given of its observance in the Book of Nehemiah. It was on the first day of the seventh month that Ezra read the Book of the Law publicly to the people, and when "the people wept, when they heard the words of the Law," Nehemiah and Ezra and the Levites said, "This day is holy unto the Lord your God; mourn not, nor weep. . . . Go your way, eat the fat, and drink the sweet, and send portions unto them for whom nothing is prepared: for this day is holy unto our Lord: neither be ye sorry; for the joy of the Lord is your strength. So the Levites stilled all the people, saying, Hold your peace, for the day is holy; neither be ye grieved. And all the people went their way to eat, and to drink, and to send portions, and to make great mirth, because they had understood the words that were declared unto them" (Neh. viii. 9—12).

Ver. 26—32.—The ceremonies to be observed on the day of atonement have been already described in ch. xvi., where it found its place as the great purification of the people and of the sanctuary. Here it is reintroduced as one of the holy days. It is the one Jewish fast; to be observed as a day of holy convocation, a day in which to afflict your souls and to offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord, and in which no manner of work was to be done; inasmuch as, like the weekly sabbath, it was a sabbath of rest from the ninth day of the month at even, from even unto even. The time of year at which it was appointed shows that one purpose of its institution was to make solemn preparation for the joyous festival of Tabernacles, which was to follow in five days' time, when the people ought to be in a state of reconciliation with God.

Vers. 33—36.—The third of the great festivals, the Feast of Tabernacles—beginning on the 15th of Tisri, as the Feast of Unleavened Bread began on the 15th of Nisan—lasted seven days, and was followed by an octave; on two days, the first day and its octave, there is to be an holy convocation, and on these no servile work is to be done. The eighth day is also a solemn assembly. The meaning of the word *atzereth*, translated a *solemn assembly*, is doubtful. It occurs ten times in the Hebrew Scriptures, and appears to signify (1) the last day of a feast (see John vii. 37, where mention is made of "the last day, that great day of the feast"); (2) a solemn assembly held on the last day of a feast; whence it comes to mean (3) a solemn assembly. The Jews gave the name to the Feast of Pentecost, as being the close of the Feast of Unleavened Bread. On each of the seven days of the Feast of Tabernacles was to be offered an offering made by fire unto the Lord. The sacrifices to be offered are enumerated in Numb. xxix. 12—38. There were to be sacrificed two rams, and fourteen lambs, and bullocks diminishing by one a day from thirteen on the first day to seven on the last. These formed the burnt sacrifices. The sin offering on each day was one kid of the goats. On the eighth day the burnt offering consisted of one bullock, one ram, seven lambs, and the sin offering, as before, of one kid of the goats. Thus there were offered in all, in the eight days, seventy-one bullocks, fifteen rams, one hundred and five lambs, and eight kids, beside meat and drink offerings.

Vera. 37, 38.—These verses form the conclusion of the immediate subject. The feasts have been enumerated in which holy convocations are to be held and public sacrifices offered; these sacrifices, it is explained, not including those of the sabbath or of individual offerers.

Vera. 39—44.—A further instruction respecting the Feast of Tabernacles is appended. When ye have gathered in the fruit of the land, not necessarily at the completion of the ingathering, but at the time at which the festival is held, ye shall take you on the first day the boughs of goodly trees. The word in the Hebrew, in its literal acceptation, means fruits of goodly trees, and hence in later times a misunderstanding arose (see 2 Maco. x. 6, 7), which led to the graceful practice of carrying in the left hand citrons (the fruit of goodly trees), and in the right hand myrtles, palms, and willows. It appears, however, that the word signifies in this place rather products than fruits, namely, leaves and branches. The command, therefore, would be, ye shall take you . . . products of goodly trees, branches

of palm trees, and the boughs of thick trees, and willows of the brooks. Originally, the purpose of these boughs was to make booths, as is shown by Neh. viii. 15, 16, "Go forth unto the mount, and fetch olive branches, and pine branches, and myrtle branches, and palm branches, and branches of thick trees, to make booths, as it is written. So the people went forth, and brought them, and made themselves booths." And ye shall rejoice before the Lord your God seven days. Accordingly we find when

the feast was observed by Ezra, after the long interval from the days of Joshua, "there was very great gladness" (Neh. viii. 17). The reason of the injunction to dwell in booths is that your generations may know that I made the children of Israel to dwell in booths, when I brought them out of the land of Egypt; that is, on the first night after they had been delivered from Egypt, and encamped at Succoth (Exod. xii. 37).

#### HOMILETICS.

Vers. 9—21; 39—43.—*The harvest festivals* among ourselves receive a sanction from the divinely appointed harvest festivals of the Jews, which were three in number.

I. THE PASSOVER HARVEST FESTIVAL. 1. On Nisan 14, the selection of the field and the ears of barley which were to be cut. 2. On Nisan 15, the progress of three appointed delegates to the spot, as the sun went down, with sickles and baskets; the reaping of the barley that had been marked to be cut, and its conveyance to the court of the temple. 3. On Nisan 16, the waving of one sheaf of the barley before the Lord, in token that the whole crop, of which it was the firstfruits, was offered to the Lord in gratitude for his having given it to man for his food. Not until the firstfruits had been presented to God, might the new year's barley be used. The firstfruits having been made holy, the whole lump was holy.

II. THE PENTECOST HARVEST FESTIVAL. 1. At the beginning of the wheat harvest, the reservation of the field from which the ears of wheat were to be cut. 2. On the forty-ninth day from Nisan 15, the progress, as before, of three appointed delegates to the spot, with sickles and baskets; the reaping of the wheat that had been marked; its conveyance to the court of the temple; its threshing, winnowing, and grinding, and the formation out of it of two loaves made with leaven. 3. On the fiftieth day from Nisan 15, the waving of the two loaves before the Lord, in token that the whole wheat crop, like the barley crop before, was sanctified for the use of man by a sample portion of it having been given to God. Not till after this might the meat offering be made of the new flour. 4. On the same day and subsequent days, the private offering of firstfruits, which might not be brought until the national offering of the firstfruits of the wheat harvest had been made, but kept up the harvest joyousness from that time to the end of the year. From each of the twenty-four districts into which Palestine was divided came a company. Each morning, while they were on the road to Jerusalem, their leader summoned them with the words, "Come ye, and let us go up to Zion, and unto Jehovah our God" (Jer. xxxi. 6), and they answered, "I was glad when they said unto me, Let us go into the house of the Lord" (Ps. cxxii. 1). "First went one who played the pipe; then followed a sacrificial bullock, destined for a peace offering, his horns gilt and garlanded with olive branches; next came the multitude, some carrying the baskets with firstfruits, others singing the psalms which many writers suppose to have been specially destined for that service, and hence to have been called 'The Songs of Ascent,' in our Authorized Version 'The Psalms of Degrees.' The poorer brought their gifts in wicker baskets, which afterwards belonged to the officiating priests; the richer theirs in baskets of silver or of gold, which were given to the temple treasury. . . . And so they passed through the length and breadth of the land, everywhere waking the echoes of praise. As they entered the city, they sang Ps. cxxii. 2, 'Our feet shall stand in thy gates, O Jerusalem.' . . . As they reached the temple mount, each one, whatever his rank or condition, took one of the baskets on his shoulder, and they ascended singing that appropriate hymn, 'Praise ye the Lord. Praise God in his sanctuary; praise him in the firmament of his power' (Ps. cl.). As they entered the temple itself, the Levites intoned Ps. xxx., 'I will extol thee, O Lord; for thou hast lifted me up, and hast not made my foes to rejoice over me'" (Edersheim, 'Temple Service'). The ceremonies of the actual presentation are detailed in Deut.

xxvi, "Thou shalt go unto the priest that shall be in those days, and say unto him, I profess this day unto the Lord thy God, that I am come unto the country which the Lord sware unto our fathers for to give us. And the priest shall take the basket out of thine hand, and set it down before the altar of the Lord thy God. And thou shalt speak and say before the Lord thy God, A Syrian ready to perish was my father, and he went down into Egypt, and sojourned there with a few, and became there a nation, great, mighty, and populous: and the Egyptians evil entreated us, and afflicted us, and laid upon us hard bondage: and when we cried unto the Lord God of our fathers, the Lord heard our voice, and looked on our affliction, and our labour, and our oppression: and the Lord brought us forth out of Egypt with a mighty hand, and with an outstretched arm, and with great terribleness, and with signs, and with wonders: and he hath brought us into this place, and hath given us this land, even a land which floweth with milk and honey. And now, behold, I have brought the firstfruits of the land, which thou, O Lord, hast given me. And thou shalt set it before the Lord thy God, and worship before the Lord thy God: and thou shalt rejoice in every good thing which the Lord thy God hath given unto thee, and unto thine house, thou, and the Levite, and the stranger that is among you" (Deut. xxvi. 3—11).

III. THE INGATHERING HARVEST FESTIVAL. 1. The dwelling in booths for a week in memorial of the encampment at Succoth, when the Israelites for the first time felt themselves to be free men. 2. The rejoicing for the final ingathering of the olives and grapes and the other fruits of the earth. "Thou shalt keep the Feast of Ingathering, which is in the end of the year, when thou hast gathered in thy labours out of the field" (Exod. xxiii. 16). "Thou shalt observe the Feast of Tabernacles seven days, after that thou hast gathered in thy corn and thy wine: and thou shalt rejoice in thy feast, thou, and thy son, and thy daughter, and thy manservant, and thy maid-servant, and the Levite, the stranger, and the fatherless, and the widow, that are within thy gates" (Deut. xvi. 13, 14). 3. The carrying of the *ethrog*, or citron, and of the *lulav*, or palm, together with a myrtle and willow branch. 4. On the last day of the feast, the drawing water from the pool of Siloam (a ceremony of a post-Mosaic date). "While the morning sacrifice was being prepared, a priest, accompanied by a joyous procession, with music, went down to the pool of Siloam, whence he drew water into a golden pitcher capable of holding three logs (rather more than two pints). . . . The priest then went up the rise of the altar and turned to the left, where there were two silver basins with narrow holes—the eastern a little wider for the wine, and the western somewhat narrower for the water. Into these the wine of the drink offering was poured, and at the same time the water from Siloam" (Ederseim, 'Temple Service'). Our Lord shows the true symbolism of this ceremony to be the gift of the Spirit. 5. The further post-Mosaic ceremony of lighting four golden candelabra in the court of the women on the night of the first day of the feast, the wicks in the candelabra having been made of the robes of the priests worn out during the past year. This ceremony probably symbolized illumination by the Spirit.

IV. MORAL LESSON. The duty of thankfulness. It is a rabbinical saying that the Holy Spirit dwells in man only through joy. This is an exaggeration, but it teaches a truth which is forgotten wherever asceticism comes to be a subject of admiration. The service of God is a joyous service. "Thou shalt rejoice before the Lord" (Deut. xvi. 11) is the injunction of the Old Testament; "Rejoice in the Lord alway; and again I say, Rejoice" (Phil. iv. 4), is that of the New Testament. It is right that there should be special occasions on which this joy may be exhibited and encouraged. Hence the reasonableness of festivals and holy days.

#### HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

*The Passover.* Ch. xxiii. 4—8; cf. Exod. xii.; also 1 Cor. v. 7, 8. In addition to the weekly "offering of rest," there were emphasized offerings of a similar character at select seasons throughout the Jewish year. These were to bring to remembrance great national deliverances, or to celebrate the blessings with which Jehovah crowned the year. The first of these feasts was the Passover. It was to celebrate the deliverance preceding the Exodus. It began with a holy convocation; there was then a

week of complete freedom from leaven; and then a holy convocation completed the special observances. Burnt offerings were also presented of a special character every day of the holy week. The following line of thought is suggested by this feast.

I. THE WHOLE POPULATION IN EGYPT WAS EXPOSED TO A COMMON DANGER. It is evident from the narrative that the destroying angel might justly have carried death into every house, and that it was only the special arrangement which prevented his doing so. For though a difference was made between the Egyptians and the Israelites, it had its reason and its root in God's sovereign grace. The Israelites may not have carried their enmity to God with so high a hand as the Egyptians, yet their pilgrimage demonstrated that the hostility was there. The judgment on the firstborn was consequently only a sample of what all deserved.

Unless we begin with the truth that "there is no difference," for "all have sinned and come short of God's glory," we are likely to underestimate the grace which maketh us afterwards to differ. We are not, properly speaking, in a state of probation, but in a state either of condemnation or of salvation. "He that believeth not is condemned already" (John iii. 18); "he that believeth is not condemned." When we start with the idea that we are really culprits and condemned already, we are stirred up to lay hold by faith of the deliverance. How we reach the blessed condition, "There is therefore now no condemnation," is beautifully symbolized by the Passover. For—

II. GOD'S PLAN OF DELIVERANCE WAS THROUGH THE SPRINKLING OF BLOOD. Each Israelite was directed to take a lamb and slay it, and sprinkle on the doorpost and lintel, with a hyssop branch, its blood. The destroying angel respected the sprinkled blood, and passed over the houses on which it appeared. Here was God's plan, by the sacrifice of the life of an innocent substitute to secure the remission of the sins of his people.

And need I say that the Paschal lamb was one of the most beautiful types of Jesus? He, as our Passover, was "sacrificed for us" (1 Cor. v. 7). It is through his blood we have remission. His life, laid down in payment of the penalty, secures our just release. The destroying angel passed over all who are under the shelter of Christ's blood.

III. THE PASCHAL LAMB WAS TO AFFORD LIFE AS WELL AS SECURE DELIVERANCE. Roasted with fire, with bitter herbs and unleavened bread, it was to be eaten by all the delivered ones. Within the blood-protected houses they stood and partook of a wholesome meal. It entered into their physical constitution, and strengthened them to begin their journey.

In the same way does Jesus Christ sustain all who trust in him. He becomes our Life. He strengthens us for our wilderness journey. The Exodus from Egypt becomes easy through his imputed strength. And so our Lord spoke not only of eating his flesh, but even of drinking his blood (John vi. 54), and so receiving his eternal life. Not more surely does vital power come to the body through the digestion of food than does spiritual power come to the soul through partaking by faith of Jesus Christ. We are not only saved from wrath through him, but sustained by his life.

IV. THE PASSOVER WAS THE DATE OF A NEW LIFE. An Exodus began with the first Passover, succeeded by a wilderness journey; and every succeeding Passover preceded a week of feasting on unleavened bread. Thus was a new and heroic life regarded as dating from the Passover. Hence the Lord changed the year at its institution, and made it the beginning of months with his people.

The same is experienced by believers. Unless our salvation by Christ's blood is succeeded by pure living and the putting away of "the leaven of malice and wickedness" (1 Cor. v. 8), we are only deceiving ourselves by supposing we are saved. Our salvation is with a view to our pilgrimage and purity. Therefore we must keep the Feast of Unleavened Bread as well as celebrate the Passover. It will not do to accept of salvation as an "indulgence." God makes no arrangement for impunity in sin. The death of the Lamb shows plainly that under God's government no sin will go unpunished. To purity we are consequently called as part and parcel of a Divine salvation.—R. M. E.

*The Feast of the Firstfruits.* Ch. xxiii. 9—14; cf. Prov. iii. 9; 1 Cor. xv. 20. The Feast of the Firstfruits began on the second day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, as the fifteenth and sixteenth verses about Pentecost imply. And curiously enough, the sheaf of the firstfruits was to be waved "on the morrow after the sabbath," that is, on what

corresponds to our present “Lord’s day.” Such a coincidence should not be overlooked, and was manifestly designed. If the Passover speaks of the death of Jesus, the first-fruits are surely intended to speak of his resurrection. The death of the Paschal lamb and the presentation of the firstfruits occupy the same temporal relation as the death of Jesus and his resurrection. Hence we find in this arrangement the following lessons:—

I. **THE FIRSTFRUITS HALLOWED THE SUBSEQUENT HARVEST.** They were a grateful acknowledgment of God’s hand in the harvest, and at the same time the condition of its being properly gathered. As one writer has very properly said, “It removed the impediment which stood opposed to its being gathered, the *ceremonial impurity*, if I may so say, which was attached to it previous to the waving of the sheaf before the Lord, until which time it was unlawful to make use of it. The prohibition on this head was express. ‘And ye shall eat neither bread, nor parched corn, nor green ears, until the selfsame day that ye have brought an offering unto your God: it shall be a statute for ever throughout your generations in all your dwellings’ (ver. 14). There was, then, you perceive, an *imputed uncleanness* attached to the harvest before the offering of the firstfruits, but which, when the sheaf was presented, was done away; and thus it is written, ‘he (the priest) shall wave the sheaf before the Lord to be accepted for you.’”<sup>1</sup> Now, it is very plain from this that Christ, the Firstfruits, hallows the subsequent human harvest. The great ingathering of souls depends on the preceding Firstfruits for consecration and acceptance. Thus do we see in symbol that he was “raised for our justification” (Rom. iv. 25).

II. **THE FIRSTFRUITS WERE THE EARNEST OF THE COMING HARVEST.** Here was a sample of what was coming and was at hand. It was first ripe, but the rest was on its way. In the very same way, the resurrection of the Saviour is the earnest and pledge of that of his people. Hence Paul says, “But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the Firstfruits of them that slept. For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order: Christ the Firstfruits; afterward they that are Christ’s at his coming” (Cor. xv. 20—23). Hence we take the risen Saviour as at once the *pledge* of the resurrection of his people, and the *sample* of what our resurrection is to be. On the *pledge* implied by his resurrection we need not dwell. It is clear from 1 Cor. xv. and from other Scriptures that his resurrection is the sure guarantee of ours.

The other thought involved is quite as precious. “Our citizenship is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall change our body of humiliation, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself” (Phil. iii. 20, 21). Just as Jesus in his post-resurrection life of forty days on earth showed marvellous superiority to the laws of nature by which these bodies of humiliation are bound, just as he was able on ministries of mercy to pass with the speed of thought from place to place, to enter through barred doors, and vanish like a vapour when he had dispensed his peace,—so do we hope to be possessed of an organ more consonant to the aspirations of our spirits, and better adapted than our present bodies can be to fulfil the purposes of God. The forty days before the ascension of our Saviour afford the insight now needed into the conditions of our future life, when we too are gathered as sheaves that are ripe into the garner above. “We know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him.”

—R. M. E.

*The Pentecost.* Ch. xxiii. 15—21; cf. Acts ii.; also Jer. ii. 3; Rom. xi. 16; and Jas. i. 18. Having found in the firstfruits a typical reference to the resurrection of Christ, we have no difficulty on the same line in finding in the harvest festival seven weeks thereafter typical reference to the harvest of the Church of God. Primarily it was eucharistic in character, but this does not exhaust its meaning. It was exactly fifty days after the Exodus that the Law was given on Sinai, and so Pentecost was associated from the outset with the “revival of the Church of God.” What happened in the Pentecost after our Lord’s last Passover was the baptism of the Holy Ghost and a revived interest in God’s holy Law.

<sup>1</sup> Lowe, on ‘The Annual Feasts of the Jews,’ pp. 27, 28.

Now, on turning to the directions about Pentecost, we find that "firstfruits" were again to be presented to the Lord, but, unlike the earlier firstfruits during the week of unleavened bread, these were to be prepared with leaven, and they were to be accompanied by a sin offering as well as burnt offerings and peace offerings. It is evident, therefore, that there is an element in the Pentecostal ritual which is not to be found in the previous ritual at all.

If Christ is typified by the first of the firstfruits presented without leaven, his people gathered out of the nations may well be typified by the second firstfruits, the accompanying leaven indicating their sinful character, notwithstanding that they are his, and the sin offering most appropriately accompanying their typical dedication.

I. LET US OBSERVE THAT THE IDEA OF THE FIRSTFRUITS IS APPLIED TO THE LORD'S PEOPLE SEVERAL TIMES IN SCRIPTURE. Thus Jeremiah calls Israel "holiness unto the Lord, and the firstfruits of his increase" (ii. 3). The same thought reappears in Paul's Epistle to the Romans, "If the firstfruits be holy, the lump is also holy" (xi. 16). James also speaks of the Lord's children in such terms as these: "Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth, that we should be a kind of firstfruits of his creatures" (i. 18). The harvest-field of God is the world, and those who are already gathered are the firstfruits. They are so far the consecrated element in the mighty population, and in spirit are laid upon God's altar.

II. THERE SEEEMS A SIGNIFICANCE IN THE TWO LOAVES. "Why," it has been said, "should the lump be divided into two parts, and not be presented whole? In order, I would venture to suggest, to set forth the two component parts of the Christian Church—the Jews and Gentiles, both made one in Christ."<sup>1</sup> Out of the harvest-field of the world the Lord requires two loaves to be presented, the Jews and the Gentiles, laid in their unity on his altar. Paul brings out this with great beauty in Eph. ii. 14—18, where the unity of Jews and Gentiles in Jesus Christ is pointed out.

III. AFTER ALL, THE CONSECRATION OF THE LORD'S PEOPLE IS AN IMPERFECT THING. Christ's consecration was perfect because sinless. Ours is imperfect and "mired with the trials of sin." Well may the firstfruits be baked with leaven; well may a sin offering be presented along with them. Our holiest acts could not stand alone, but need to be repented of. Atonement has to cover the holiest efforts of the Lord's people.

Thus is all spiritual pride kept under, since at our very best we are "unprofitable servants."

IV. THE PENTECOSTAL OUTFORING AFTER OUR LORD'S ASCENSION PRESENTS THE REALITY OF WHICH THE RITUAL WAS THE TYPE. In this glorious ingathering there was: 1. A penitential spirit. It was for this Peter called (Acts ii. 38). 2. A worldwide imitation (Acts ii. 39). The promise was to those "that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." 3. A separation of many from the world, that they might consecrate themselves to God (Acts ii. 41). 4. A great unity of spirit (Acts ii. 44—47).

It is this vivifying inspiration we all need; and may God send it soon!—R. M. E.

*The Feast of Trumpets.* Ch. xxiii, 23—25; cf. Numb. x. 1—10; Exod. xix. 19; Ps. lxxxix. 15. The first mention of the trumpet is in Exod. xix. 13, 19, in connection with the giving of the Law. "When the trumpet soundeth long, they shall come up to the mount" (Exod. xix. 13). It was God's method of summoning the people to covenant privilegea. It was further used for the calling of assemblies, for the beginning of journeys, for alarms, and at the new moons and festal seasons, when it was blown over the sacrifices. Those who knew the significance of the sacrifices could rejoice in the trumpet-sound which proclaimed them complete. No wonder it is said, "Blessed is the people that know the joyful sound" (*νύμφη*; literally, "sound of a trumpet"): "they shall walk, O Lord, in the light of thy countenance" (Ps. lxxxix. 15).

The analogy of faith, therefore, warrants us in taking the Feast of Trumpets as symbolical of God's message of mercy to man. The gospel preached is God's trumpet, summoning men to the privileges and duties of the Christian life. This suggests—

I. THE GOOD TIDINGS ARE OF A FINISHED SACRIFICE. It is only when the sacrifice of Jesus is the foundation of the appeal that man is arrested, trumpet-like, by the

<sup>1</sup> Lowe, *ut supra*, p. 50.

gospel. The Lamb has been slain, the atonement complete, and, consequently, poor sinners are summoned to joy.

It would be no such joyful message if we were summoned to establish our own righteousness instead of submitting, as now, to the righteousness of God. It is a present salvation, on the ground of the finished sacrifice of Jesus, which constitutes the fountain of the purest joy. No such joyful trumpet-tones were ever heard by human ears in other religions as God gives when he says, "I have heard thee in a time accepted, and in the day of salvation have I succoured thee: behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation" (2 Cor. vi. 2).

II. THE GOSPEL TRUMPET SUMMONS US TO REST. On the Feast of Trumpets "ye shall do no servile work therein." It was a summons to sabbatic rest. And truly the gospel is a call to put off the servile spirit, the obedience which comes through fear, and to enter into God's rest. "We who believe do enter into rest." Christian experience is sabbath rest after the worry of worldly experience. We lay down our burden, and pass into Divine peace. The Saturday evening of experience is when, through grace, we put away our worldliness, our feverish anxieties, our low and selfish ideals, and the sabbath morning experience is rest in God's love and bounty.

III. THE GOSPEL TRUMPET SUMMONS US TO PERSONAL SACRIFICE. If the servile work is to be surrendered for sabbath rest, we must go forward to the duty indicated. "But ye shall offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord." For this is the gospel plan—acceptance and rest on the ground of a completed sacrifice, and the personal dedication as a living sacrifice in gratitude for such unmerited favour. From the one Great Sacrifice for us we proceed gratefully to such personal sacrifice as God's honour and glory require. The love manifested in the sacrifice of Christ "constrains us to live not unto ourselves, but unto him who died for us and rose again" (2 Cor. v. 14, 15). Self-righteousness is not self-sacrifice; rather is it proud bargaining for that which God offers as a gift. But, when the gift is accepted, self is in the acceptance crucified, and a life of devotion becomes self-sacrificing indeed.

IV. THE GOSPEL TRUMPET IS TO BE SUCCEDED BY THE TRUMP OF THE RESURRECTION. All who in their graves of sin hear the voice of the Son of God, and who, through hearing, live (John v. 25), are destined to hear another joyful note from the same trumpet: "For the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life" (John v. 28, 29). This is "the voice of the archangel and the trump of God" through which the dead in Christ shall rise (1 Thess. iv. 16). "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: (for the trumpet shall sound,) and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed" (1 Cor. xv. 51, 52).

Such are the summons which God gives to men to privilege, to peace, and at the last to everlasting felicity. The preachers who give no uncertain sound, but proclaim with trumpet-tongue the gospel, are the heralds who are preparing for the day of the Lord, with its everlasting rest and light and love!—R. M. E.

*The annual repentance—the Day of Atonement.* Ch. xxiii. 26—32; cf. ch. xvi.; Heb. ix. 12. Into the ritual of the Day of Atonement we need not here enter, after what has been said on the subject under ch. xvi. But the reference here is to the spirit of repentance which was to characterize the people on that day. It was, in fact, a call to the whole congregation to repent and be reconciled to God. As the Day of Atonement is in all respects the climax of the sacrificial worship, it may be useful here to notice the spirit which belonged to that worship and the corresponding spirit in man which it demanded.

I. THE SPIRIT OF JUDAISM IS THAT OF EXCLUSION FROM THE DIVINE PRESENCE. Ever since man's fall until the veil was rent at the death of Jesus, man was deservedly kept at a distance from God. Sin is a separating power; as long as it is harboured it prevents near access to him. And even when, in the Exodus, God delivered a chosen people to bring them to himself (Exod. xix. 4), they were only permitted to come up to certain barriers round about the holy mount. When, moreover, the Lord transferred his dwelling-place from the top of Sinai to the tent or tabernacle provided by his pilgrim people, he insisted on having a private apartment, railed off from vulgar gaze, and only

allowed one representative man, the high priest, to draw nigh unto him once a year. He certainly sent this honoured individual forth with his blessing, to encourage the people waiting without. But the whole arrangement of the Day of Atonement was on the principle of excluding the people until such times as they might profitably have closer access. "God sent his people," says an able writer, "his blessing, to show them that he had not forgotten them. But he would not see them. Even the high priest saw but a very little of him at this annual solemn time. The cloud of fragrant incense filled the most holy place, and barred the view."<sup>1</sup>

II. THERE IS NOTHING SO HUMILIATING AS THIS DENIAL OF ACCESS. On the Day of Atonement the people came to the tabernacle, and saw their select representative enjoy the privilege of drawing nigh to God all alone. Not a man of them dare venture beyond the veil. Nadab and Abihu, who seem to have done so, intoxicated by their elevation to the priesthood and perhaps also by wine, perished before the Lord. The Israelites felt at the tabernacle that they were an *excluded* people. This would lead to self-examination, and to repentance for the sin which excluded them. Doubtless the ritual of the great Day of Atonement would have a soothing effect upon their spirits. The blessing would fall upon their souls like balm. At the same time, they could not but feel that access to God was for them through a mediator, and that they were kept at a very humiliating distance.

III. OUR GREAT HIGH PRIEST HAS GIVEN US THE REALITY OF ACCESS IN THAT HE HAS BECOME OUR FORERUNNER. This is the beautiful idea suggested by the apostle in the Hebrews (vi. 20). Christ has not entered the holiest to enjoy a privilege in solitude. He has entered it as our Forerunner, to announce our approach. This applies, not only to the everlasting felicity of heaven, but also to present devotional access to God. Through him we are permitted to draw nigh. The veil is rent; therefore we draw near with holy boldness. We are no longer an excluded people, but in the enjoyment of close communion. When the veil was rent at the death of Jesus, the ordinary priests were thereby raised to the privilege of the high priest. All had alike access to God. Hence we are to live up to our privilege as believers; for we are priests unto God, and access is our right through the rending of the veil of our Redeemer's flesh.

Thus do we see the secret of penitence on the Day of Atonement, and how it is the preliminary arranged by the All-wise to communion with himself close and eternal.—R. M. E.

*The pilgrim spirit as illustrated in the Feast of Tabernacles.* Ch. xxiii. 33—43; cf. Ps. xxxix. 12; Heb. xi. 13; 1 Pet. ii. 11. The seventh month was a very celebrated one in the Jewish year. It was the sabbatic month, so to speak, when religious services of the most important character took place. The Feast of Trumpets introduced the month, and joyful were the anticipations of blessing. Then on the tenth day, came the great ritual of atonement, with its penitential sadness. Then came, on the fifteenth day, the beginning of the Feast of Tabernacles. In the rainless harvest-time the people were expected, even after their settlement in Canaan, to spend a week in booths or tents, and with boughs of goodly trees, with palm branches, and with willows of the brook to rejoice before God. Now this feast was—

I. A CELEBRATION OF THE PILGRIMAGE OF THE WILDERNESS. It was "that your generations may know that I made the children of Israel to dwell in booths, when I brought them out of the land of Egypt" (ver. 43). It is most important to keep a great deliverance in mind. Hence the people were enjoined once a year to become pilgrims again, as their fathers had been. We should never forget how the Lord has led his people in every age out of bondage into pilgrimage and freedom as the avenue to rest.

II. IT WAS A CELEBRATION OF THE DIVINE PROVISION IN THE WILDERNESS. For it was a harvest festival, and the fruits of the earth had been gathered in before the feast began. Before them lay, so to speak, the bounties of God's providence, just as the manna lay morning by morning before their fathers. God was praised, therefore, for crowning the *year* with his goodness, as their fathers praised him for crowning with his goodness each *day*. It was consequently a eucharistic service in the highest degree.

III. IT WAS A CELEBRATION OF THE STRANGER AND PILGRIM SPIRIT WHICH GOD

<sup>1</sup> Tait's 'Thoughts for the Thoughtful,' p. 160.

**FOSTERS IN ALL HIS PEOPLE.** The voluntary leaving of their homes for a season to live in a "tented state" was a beautiful embodiment of the stranger and pilgrim spirit to which we are called. God in the wilderness dwelt as the Great Pilgrim in a tent with his pilgrim people; and year by year he enjoined his people in their generations to become literally "strangers with him" (Ps. xxxix. 12), as their fathers had been. And the same danger threatens us, to feel at home in this world and to give up the pilgrimage. Hence the apostle's warning is ever needful: "Dearly beloved, I beseech you as strangers and pilgrims, abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul" (1 Pet. ii. 11). If the world does not seem strange to us, it is because we are not living as near as we ought to God. The more access we have to him, the greater will be our moral distance from the world.

**IV. THE JOY OF THE FEAST OF TABERNACLES WAS ENHANCED BY THE HOME-GOING WHICH LAY BEYOND IT.** The "tented state" is not intended to be permanent. Its value lies in its temporary nature. Canaan lay in sunlight beyond the wilderness, and the thought of "home" there encouraged them in their pilgrimage. The week's camping out after Canaan had been reached made them enjoy their home life all the more. In the same way, while we confess like the patriarchs to be "strangers and pilgrims upon the earth," we are seeking, and rejoicing in the prospect of yet reaching, a better country, with a city of God and permanent abodes (Heb. xi. 13-16). The pilgrimage is joyful because it is destined to end in the everlasting home. Perpetual pilgrimage no man could desire, for this would be perpetual exile from legitimate home joys. A long pilgrimage can be welcomed if it lead towards everlasting joy in the Father's house. And is there not an element of triumph associated with such a celebration as this Feast of Tabernacles? It indicates victory over worldly feeling through faith in God. No wonder, then, that palm branches and goodly boughs were waved by joyous ones before the Lord. It is into victorious joy he summons all his people as the earnest of the everlasting joy with which he is yet to crown them.—R. M. E.

**Vers. 4-14.—*The Passover.*** Under this general title we include the Feast of Unleavened Bread, and the offering of the firstfruits which was connected with it. The history of the institution is given in Exod. xii. That the Passover was a type of Christ is evident (see 1 Cor. v. 6-8).

**I. THE LAMB TYPIFIED HIS PERSON.** (John i. 36.) 1. *It was taken from the flock* (Exod. xii. 9). (1) As it had been one with the flock, so was Jesus one with us. His humanity was no phantom, but a reality. (2) What an honour is conferred upon us, that the God of glory should stoop to assume our nature, to become "bone of our bone"! Let us not dishonour ourselves by sinning against such grace. 2. *It was a male of the first year.* (1) This was ordered because the male is the stronger animal, and was viewed as an emblem of excellence. Christ amongst men is the most excellent; "the fairest amongst ten thousand." (2) Hence he is distinguished as "The Son of David," as "The Seed of Abraham," as "The Son of man." David had many sons, but in comparison with him they were nowhere; so he is the Son of David, the one glorious descendant who throws all others into the shade. So with the seed of Abraham. So with the sons of Adam. In the whole race there is no one to compare with him. 3. *It was without blemish.* (1) The blemishes that would disqualify a Paschal lamb were physical, and so, abstractedly considered, of little account. But these blemishes were typical of moral evils, and in this view were very important. (2) But Christ was, in the moral sense, absolutely blemishless. He was unique. Singular, however, not in eccentricity but in transcendent goodness. As under the microscope the works of God are seen to differ essentially from those of men, appearing more variously and wonderfully beautiful as they are more nearly examined under higher powers, so the more minutely Christ is considered the more wonderful and beautiful is he seen to be.

**II. ITS SACRIFICE FORESHADOWED HIS PASSION.** 1. *The lamb suffered vicariously.* (1) When taken from the flock the rest of the flock was spared. So was Jesus chosen that by his suffering his nation and his race might not perish (see John xi. 49-53). (2) The blood of the lamb was sprinkled on the doorposts of the houses to avert the wrath of the destroying angel. The firstborn in every house was sacrificed where no vicarious blood appeared. So are we saved from wrath by the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ through faith. (3) Those saved from destruction through the blood of the lamb

were immediately led out of Egypt, and set on their way to Canaan. So those justified through the blood of Christ are delivered also from the bondage of corruption, and set on their way to heaven. 2. *Remarkable circumstances claim attention.* (1) The lamb was to be "of the first year," i.e. in its prime. So was Christ in the prime of his manhood when he was offered. (2) It was to be offered "in the place which the Lord should choose" (Deut. xvi. 5-7). That place was Jerusalem (2 Kings xxi. 7; Ps. cxxxii. 13, 14). There also "our Passover was sacrificed for us." (3) "In the fourteenth day of the first month at even is the Lord's Passover" (ver. 5). Some think that our Lord, in accordance with the usage of the Karaites, or Scriptiarii, killed and ate the Passover a day earlier than the Pharisees, and that he expired on the cross at the time when the Traditionarii were employed in killing their Paschal lambs (see Ikenii, "Dissert. Theolog.", tom. ii. chs. ix., x., xi.). Be this as it may, the word in the text translated "at even" is literally *between the evenings*; that is, between the chronological and ecclesiastical, which would be at the "ninth hour," or three p.m. This was the very hour at which Jesus expired (Luke xxiii. 44-46). (4) It was ordered that no bone of the Paschal lamb should be broken. And whereas the legs of the malefactors were broken, the soldiers, seeing that Jesus was dead already, brake not his legs (see John xix. 31-36). Such things could not have been ordered by chance.

III. THE FEAST CORRESPONDED TO THE CHRISTIAN EUCHARIST. 1. *The latter was accommodated to the former.* (1) This is evident from the history of the institution. For the cup of the Eucharist Christ used that cup of the Passover, which was called by the Jews the "cup of blessing," and which description Paul applies to the Christian cup (1 Cor. x. 16). For the bread of the Supper he used that of the Passover (Luke xxii. 15-20). (2) So when Paul speaks of Christ as "our Passover sacrificed for us," he adds, "let us keep the feast," meaning, *allusively*, the Feast of Unleavened Bread, and *really* that which replaces it in the Church. 2. *Both are retrospective and anticipative.* (1) The Hebrews commemorated the type, viz. the deliverance from the destroying angel and from Egypt. The Christians commemorate the antitype, viz. the deliverance of souls from the anger of God and from the tyranny of sin. (2) The Hebrews anticipated their entrance into Canaan. The Christians anticipate the joys of heaven; the new wine of the kingdom. 3. *Both are tokens of Church communion.* (1) The Passover was not the rite *initiatory* into the Church of Israel. Circumcision was that rite. To this, baptism, under the gospel, corresponds, and is therefore called the circumcision of Christianity (Col. ii. 11, 12). (2) But it was the rite *continuative* of such communion. Exclusion from the Passover was excommunication under the Law. So is the Eucharist the sign amongst Christians of a continued Church communion.

"On the morrow after the sabbath," viz. of the Paschal week, the sheaf of the first-fruits was waved before the Lord (vers. 10, 11). This was a type of Christ in his resurrection as the Firstfruits of the great harvest (see 1 Cor. xv. 20-23). But when Christ died, the sabbath of the Paschal week happened upon the day in which he lay in the tomb (comp. John xix. 31; Luke vi. 1). Thus the morrow after this sabbath was precisely that first day of the week on which our Lord arose (Mark xvi. 9). How strengthening to faith are all these correspondences!—J. A. M.

Vers. 15-22.—*The Feast of Harvest.* This was the second of the three great festivals upon which all the males of Israel were required to assemble at Jerusalem (see Exod. xxiii. 14-17; Deut. xvi. 16). Let us consider—

I. THE DUTIES THEN ENJOINED UPON THE WORSHIPPERS. 1. *They were to meet in holy convocation.* (1) This was intended to keep alive their interest in the service of God. Were sabbaths and public services of religion to cease, men would soon forget God. (2) All Israel looked each other in the face. Religion is eminently social. And as these convocations were types of heavenly things, this suggested the recognitions and greetings of the future (see Heb. xii. 22, 23). (3) On this day servile work was to cease. The teaching here is that when we congregate in heaven we shall be emancipated from the curse of toil (comp. Gen. iii. 17; Rev. xxii. 3). 2. *They were to present two wave loaves.* (1) These were composed of two tenth-deals of fine flour. They were to sanctify the wheat-harvest as the sheaf of the firstfruits sanctified the barley harvest. Hence those also are called "firstfruits" (vers. 17, 20; Exod. xxxiv. 22). (2) They were to be baked *with leaven*. As the *unleavened* bread of the Passover was a memorial

of the haste with which they departed from Egypt, this was to express thankfulness to God for the blessings of ordinary food, together with their rest in Canaan. (3) One loaf was to be eaten by the worshipper, while the other was God's. That more completely given to God was divided. One portion was burnt on the altar, while the priests took the remainder (Numb. xviii. 9—11). This explains the injunction that they should be waved along with the peace offerings. We learn here that our ordinary bread should be religiously eaten (see 1 Cor. x. 31). (4) These wave loaves constituted one of three meat offerings of the whole congregation. The first was the sheaf, or omer, of the firstfruits of the barley harvest (vers. 9—14). This was the second. And the third was the twelve loaves of the shewbread (Exod. xxv. 30; ch. xxiv. 5—9). Could there be here a prophetic anticipation of the order of the resurrection, viz. "Christ the Firstfruits; afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming;" and, finally, the "rest of the dead," destined to live again at the end of the millennial reign, when death shall be abolished? (comp. 1 Cor. xv. 23—26; Rev. xx.). (5) Beside the firstfruits, which were strictly national, each person had to bring his own firstfruits to the temple (see Deut. xxvi. 1—10). God would have us ever to remember that religion is personal as well as public. 3. *They were to offer sacrifices.* (1) The burnt offerings appointed were seven lambs of the first year without blemish, one young bullock, and two rams, or, as elsewhere expressed, two young bullocks and one ram (comp. ver. 18; Numb. xxviii. 27). As burnt offerings were intended to expiate sins against affirmative precepts, the godly worshipper would pray during the burning, as David prayed (Ps. xix. 13). The meat and drink offerings proper to burnt offerings accompanied (ver. 18). These were distinct from the two tenth-deals waved to sanctify the harvest. (2) A kid of the goats was appointed for a sin offering (ver. 19). As sin offerings were to expiate sins committed in ignorance, the thoughts of the worshipper were carried forward to the Great Sin Sacrifice of Calvary. (3) Two lambs of the first year were appointed for the peace offering. These were distinguished from those usually offered as "holy to the Lord for the priest." They were to be eaten by him before the Lord. For the meat offering which ordinarily accompanied the peace offerings, in this case the two loaves of the firstfruits were substituted (vers. 19, 20).

II. THE NOTES OF TIME, WITH THEIR REASONS. 1. *They counted from the putting in of the sickle.* (1) This, however, was not left to private option. That would have worked endless confusion; for it was a public, national, act. The Lord is a God of order (1 Cor. xiv. 40). It would have tended to will-worship. The evils of this are seen in the Romish Church. We cannot too literally abide by the letter of Divine precept. (2) It was limited to the second day of the Passover week (vers. 15, 16). From this reckoning the Jews call this Feast of Harvest (וָיְמֵי חֶנְכָה) the fiftieth day. For the same reason, it is in the New Testament called the Pentecost (Acts ii. 1; xx. 16; 1 Cor. xvi. 8). 2. *They commemorated the giving of the Law.* (1) The observance of the Passover was on the fourteenth of the first month (Exod. xii. 18), leaving seventeen days of that month to run. To these add thirty days of the second month, and we have forty-seven days. But the Law was given on the third day after Moses came into the wilderness of Sinai, which was in the beginning of the third month (Exod. xix. 1, 10, 11). These three days added bring the number up to fifty. (2) Well might the Israelites have a festival of thanksgiving for the giving of the Law; for thereby they were honoured and blessed as no other nation had ever been (Deut. iv. 8). 3. *They anticipated the publication of the gospel.* (1) The gospel is the Law of God, published from Zion, in contradistinction to that published from Sinai (see Isa. ii. 3). That publication took place "when the day of Pentecost was fully come." (2) The fifty days were counted from the second day of the Passover week, on which the firstfruits of the barley harvest were presented (vers. 15, 16). That "firstfruits" were a type of Christ in his resurrection. After that event he was seen of his disciples during forty days. The Pentecost followed exactly ten days after the Ascension (see Luke xxiv. 49; Acts ii. 1). (3) Note, further, that the Holy Ghost was given on the first day of the week. The Paschal lamb was eaten on Thursday. The Friday on which our Lord was crucified was the first day of the Passover week. On the Saturday the firstfruits were offered up. Consequently, the Pentecost, which was the fiftieth day after, would fall upon the Sunday. Thenceforth this became "the Lord's day," or the Christian sabbath (see Lightfoot on Acts ii.).

Where gratitude is there will be goodness. Hence the injunction to care for the poor and the stranger (ver. 22). This spirit of the Law is also the genius of the gospel.—J. A. M.

Vers. 23—44.—*The hebdomad.* Seven in Scripture is a very remarkable number. In the text it is repeated in so many forms that it forces itself upon our attention.

I. HEBDOMADS ARE CONSPICUOUS IN THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE LAW. 1. *They appear in the week of days.* (1) The foundation of this is the Creation week. The patriarchal sabbath became incorporated into the Mosaic Law. There were other weeks of days and sabbaths. In the text there are three of these, with a sabbath on the first and another on the eighth day. (2) Could there be in these an anticipation of the change of the sabbath from the seventh day to the first or eighth under the Christian dispensation? The sabbaths of the seventh and eighth days may point to the rest of the millennium in the first instance, and to that of the new heavens and earth in the second. In observing the Lord's day, it would be highly edifying to have these anticipations in mind. 2. *They appear again in the week of months.* (1) The entire cycle of the feasts of the Lord was comprised in such a week. It commenced on the 14th day of Abib, with the Passover, instituted in commemoration of the Exodus. Then followed, in their appointed seasons, the Feast of Unleavened Bread; that of the Firstfruits; the Feast of Harvest, which is also called the Feast of Weeks (Exod. xxxiv. 22; Deut. xvi. 10, 16; 2 Chron. viii. 13). The series ended with the festivals of the seventh month. (2) During the five months remaining there was no annual feast. The daily sacrifices and those of the sabbaths and moons were of course continued. (3) The moon was a symbol of the Church, and its changes represented the mutations through which it passes in this world, but when it has fulfilled its great week of changes it will be perfected for ever in heaven. 3. *They appear again in the week of years.* (1) The Law had its septenary division of years, with a continually repeated seventh year of rest for the land (chs. xxv. 3—7; xxvi. 34, 35; 2 Chron. xxxvi. 21). (2) Founded upon this also was a greater period of a week of weeks of years, with its year of jubilee (ch. xxv. 8—17). The lessons of the sabbatic and jubilee years will come under consideration in their proper places.

II. HEBDOMADS ARE CONSPICUOUS IN THE CHRONOLOGY OF PROPHECY. 1. *The days of the week are taken as prophetic.* (1) David, and Peter from him, notes that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years (Ps. xc. 4; 2 Pet. iii. 8). Paul also mentions the sabbath-keeping of the future "which remaineth to the people of God" (Heb. iv. 9). And John describes that rest as extending over a thousand years (Rev. xx. 4). (2) To this agrees the tradition in the house of Elias, a teacher who lived about two hundred years before our Lord, and which is thought to have been derived from Elijah the Tishbite. It purports that this world is to endure in its imperfect state six thousand years: two thousand before the Law; two thousand under the Law; two thousand under Messiah; and then a thousand years in a state of renovation (see Mede, 536, 776, 894; also Bishop Newton's "Disser.", vol. iii. 335). (3) The same view is no less definitely put forth by Barnabas. He makes each day of the Creation week represent a thousand years of the subsequent history of the world, and the sabbath he makes to stand for the reign of peace, or millennium of John. 2. *Dispensations are measured by weeks of times.* (1) The "times of the Gentiles" are accepted to be the same as the "seven times," during which Israel was destined to be trodden down of them. Upon the year-day principle these are the double of the "time, time, and dividing of a time" of Daniel and John, during which the little horn was to wear out the saints, and represent 2520 years. The larger period commences with the literal Babylon, and the smaller with the mystical. (2) But how can the Patriarchal, Levitical, and Christian dispensations be limited to six thousand years, if each is to extend over 2520? They do so by overlapping each other. Thus the patriarchal extends "from Adam to Moses" (Rom. v. 13, 14), which space comprises "seven times." The Jewish then reckons from Shem the patriarch, selected as the depositary of the covenant, to Jesus. The interval from Shem to Jesus measures "seven times." The dispensation of the Gentiles, already described as the "times of the Gentiles," forms the third. It began with the rise of the ancient Babylonish power, and will end with the overthrow of the mystical Babylon.

III. HEBDOMADS ARE NOT WITHOUT FOUNDATION IN NATURE. 1. *They are not very obviously marked in the heavens.* (1) The day is measured by the revolution of the earth upon its axis. The month is measured by the revolution of the moon in her orbit. The year is determined by the revolution of the earth about the sun. (2) But where are we to find the measure of the week? The quarters of the moon do not measure it, for the month is more than four times seven days. 2. *Yet they have a foundation in nature.* (1) It is now well known that changes in animals are regulated by weeks. Dr. Laycock, summing up what he had advanced on this subject in a series of remarkable papers, says, "The facts I have briefly glanced at are general facts, and cannot happen day after day in so many millions of animals of every kind from larva or ovum of a minute insect up to man at definite periods, from a mere chance or coincidence; and although temperature, food, domestication, and other modifying circumstances may and do interrupt the regularity with which the various processes I have alluded to are conducted, yet upon the whole it is, I think, impossible to come to any less general conclusion than this. That in animals changes occur every three and a half, seven, fourteen, twenty-one, or twenty-eight days, or at some definite number of weeks" (see *Lancet*, 1842—43). (2) The words recorded by Moses (Gen. i. 14) guide us to the consideration of the revolution of the *epacts*, or differences in solar and lunar measures of time. And it is most admirable that the epacts of the times of prophetic chronology as measured by true solar and lunar years come out in *weeks* (see Guinnes's 'Approaching End of the Age').

From this interesting subject we learn: 1. That prophecy is from God. 2. That the God of nature is the God of providence. 3. That religion should be interwoven with secular concerns.—J. A. M.

Vers. 23—25.—*The Feast of Trumpets.* "The Old Testament," says Augustine, "when rightly understood, is one grand prophecy of the New." The New Testament is the key to the Old.

I. THE MOON WAS A SYMBOL OF THE CHURCH. 1. *Its lustre sets forth her beauty.* (1) Even in our Northern climate the moon is a beautiful object; but in Oriental skies she is remarkably so. Solomon compares the beauty of the bride to that of the moon (Song vi. 10). (2) She shines in a light borrowed from the sun. So is the lustre of Jesus the loveliness of his Church (see Isa. xxx. 26; comp. Matt. v. 14 with John viii. 12; Rev. xii. 1; xxi. 23). (3) As the moon enlightens the darkness in the absence of the sun, so is the Church the light of the world in the absence of her Lord (see Matt. v. 14; John i. 4; ix. 5; Phil. ii. 15). All men should be attracted to the communion of the Church by the charms of her beauty. Professors should beware how they may hinder this issue by their inconsistencies. 2. *Its changes set forth her vicissitudes.* (1) The renewals of the moon will represent the dispensations through which she passes. Thus the patriarchal, which is divided into two ages, viz. that before the Flood, and that which followed. The Mosaic, which also is divided into two ages, viz. that of the tabernacle and that of the temple, the latter being more eminently the age of prophecy. The Christian dispensation likewise is distributed into two ages, viz. the present militant and suffering age, and the triumphant age of the millennium to come. Perhaps the seventh moon may then anticipate the celestial state to follow (see Isa. lx. 19, 20). (2) The phases through which each moon passes will represent corresponding minor changes in the Church. She too has her waxings and wanings. Sometimes she is brightened by revivals of purity and zeal, which are followed by seasons of apostacy and degeneration. Sometimes she rejoices in seasons of peace and prosperity; then suffers persecutions and reverses.

II. THE SEVENTH WAS DISTINGUISHED AMONG THE MOONS. 1. *It was a high sabbath.* (1) The new moons were all observed as sabbaths. No servile work was done in any of them (see Amos viii. 5). They were memorials of the believers' rest from servility to Satan. (2) But this moon was the beginning of the civil year, and is believed to be the time of the Creation, when vegetable nature was in perfection. It gratefully commemorated the old Creation. It joyfully anticipated the new. 2. *It was a holy convocation.* (1) The people assembled for worship. This is God's order. Those who neglect public worship under the pretext of "worshipping the God of nature in the fields" follow their own order. (2) In company, they heard the Word of God (see

2 Kings iv. 23; Isa. lxvi. 23; Ezek. xlvi. 1; Amos viii. 5). (3) They feasted together upon the sacrifices (Numb. xxviii. 11—15). Thus they anticipated the spiritual festivities of the gospel, and the glorious festivities of heaven. (4) They rejoiced in the light of the moon (Ps. lxxxi. 3; lxxxix. 15, 16). If the Psalmist rejoiced in the anticipation of the light of the gospel moon, how much more should we rejoice under that light? 3. *It was a memorial of blowing of trumpets.* (1) The trumpets were blown upon every moon, but on the seventh so signally that it thence became distinguished as the Feast of Trumpets. The trumpeting began at sunrise and continued till sundown. This moon not only ushered in the new month, as the others did, but also the new (civil) year. (2) The trumpets were sounded over the sacrifices. These were in greater number. There were not only the daily sacrifices, which were never superseded, and the ordinary sacrifices of the moons, but burnt offerings, meat and drink offerings, and a sin offering, proper to this feast (Numb. xxix. 2—6). The sounding of the trumpets over these indicated the preaching of the gospel to be the preaching of the cross of Christ (see Isa. xxvii. 13). (3) The trumpeting was in *memorial*. If it referred to the giving of the Law, we are reminded of the trumpet that then sounded from Sinai; and the gospel law was sounded out from Sion. If the memorial referred to the Creation, then we are reminded that the Psalmist calls the word by which God made the world, "the voice of his thunder" (Ps. civ. 7). We are also reminded of the singing of the morning stars and shouting of the sons of God (Job xxxviii. 6, 7). The shouting and thundering at the Creation and at the giving of the Law and the preaching of the gospel are but the echoes of the voices and trumpeting of the Judgment of the great day. "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear." When the last trumpet is sounded, it will be, as on the Feast of Trumpets, at the finishing of the gathering of all the fruits of the earth.—J. A. M.

Vers. 26—32.—*The Feast of Expiation.* This great occasion, the ceremonies of which are more particularly described in ch. xvi., was to be—

I. A HOLY CONVOCATION, IN WHICH THE PEOPLE WERE TO AFFLICT THEIR SOULS. Learn hence: 1. *That sin must be mourned.* (1) It should be mourned in *secret*. There are matters which it may be proper to confess to God alone. The confession of these to others would serve no useful purpose. It might even be productive of harm. (2) It should be *publicly* mourned. Where there are national sins they should be openly confessed. Sins against society should be publicly owned. The general public confession of sin is useful in calling individual sin to remembrance. (3) Contrition for sin is indispensable. To neglect it is to incur excision (ver. 29). 2. *The mourning must be thorough.* (1) No secular work must be done on this day in which men were to afflict their souls. Not only were they on this day to rest from "servile work," as on the other annual feasts; the rest must be as strict as upon the weekly sabbaths. If we would have salvation, we must be in earnest. We must not suffer the claims of the world to divert us from this great business. (2) The soul must be afflicted with *fasting*. The *animal soul* is here referred to (see ch. xvi. 31; Numb. xxix. 7; Isa. lviii. 5, 6). The spirit of a religious fast is abstinence from all kinds of sin. 3. *The soul is to be afflicted because of the atonement.* (1) They were to bring an "offering by fire unto the Lord" on this day. The sin and trespass offering had respect to particular sins, but the burnt offering was for sin in the abstract. The sacrifices of this day were of the greatest importance, and eminently typified the Great Atonement of the gospel. (2) Penitence is never perfect till we get a view of Calvary. Because he is merciful we fear God with a gracious fear. With such a fear in holiness perfected (2 Cor. vii. 1).

II. THIS HOLY CONVOCATION WAS ON THE TENTH DAY OF THE SEVENTH MONTH. 1. *This was to suggest the riches of redemption.* (1) For the mystery of the number ten is *wealth*. So the Hebrew word for *ten* (*wy*) is also the word for *riches*. (2) Hence because of his riches of merit and wealth of blessings, viz. as the Depository of all the promises, Christ is called a *Tenth* (see Isa. vi. 13). (3) When Isaiah calls Christ the *Tenth*, he describes the *Tenth* as of the nature of bread. Bread is the "staff of life," and Christ is the "Tree of life"—the Bread of immortality. Hence all the holy bread, as prefiguring Christ, was composed of *tenth*-deals of flour. So the meat, or bread, offering; so the firstfruits; so the shewbread; even the manna was gathered in *omers*, or *tenths* (see Exod. xvi. 36; see also Mal. iii. 10). 2. *The association of the tenth day with the seventh month also is suggestive.* (1) It suggests the perfection of

riches to be associated with the mysteries of the day. This we find only in connection with the great atonement of Christ. Other wealth is poverty compared with the "riches of Christ." (2) Note elsewhere the association of seven and ten in weeks of decades. Thus the term of human life is a week of decades, at the close of which the rich rewards of a faithful life are reaped (Ps. xc. 10). But "the wicked do not live out half their days." They come short of the "durable riches." The week of decades was the term of the Babylonian captivity (Jer. xxiv. 11; xxix. 10). And towards the close of that period the week of weeks of decades was revealed to Daniel as destined to mark the crisis of the great atonement (see Dan. ix. 24). (3) Dr. Lightfoot computes that the Feast of Expiation was the anniversary of that on which Moses came the last time down from the mount, bringing with him the unbroken tables and the assurance of God's reconciliation to Israel, the very glory of the gospel beaming in his face. Moses in this was a similar type to the high priest on the Day of Atonement (see 2 Cor. iii. 12-18). (4) It is still more remarkable that Jesus, on the anniversary of these events, actually entered the cloud of the Shechinah, and passed within the vail into the heaven of heavens (see reasoning to this conclusion in the appendix of Guinness's 'Approaching End of the Age'). These coincidences are not accidental. They are "the Lord's doing, and marvellous in our eyes." Such things as these, and in such the Holy Scriptures abound, prove them to be from God, and should encourage our faith and obedience.—J. A. M.

Vers. 33-44.—*The Feast of Tabernacles.* This was the last of the great annual festivals of the Hebrews. It was a season of great joyfulness. Let us notice—

I. THE REASONS OF ITS APPOINTMENT. 1. *It was to assure them of God's return to dwell with them.* (1) This reason is not given in the text, but may be gathered from the history. The commission to build the tabernacle of witness, which had been suspended in consequence of their rebellion, was renewed to Moses in the mount. When he brought them these good tidings, he directed them to construct booths, for they were to abide in their present encampment until the work should be accomplished. (2) In due time the Shechinah possessed the tabernacle. This glorious event foreshadowed the sublime mystery of the incarnation (comp. John i. 14). How wonderful is that grace of the gospel according to which believers become the shrines of Deity! (1 Cor. iii. 16; vi. 19; 2 Cor. vi. 16). 2. *It was to remind their children that their fathers camped in the desert.* (1) The condition of Israel in the wilderness described the Christian in his journey through the world in quest of the heavenly Canaan. (2) The dwelling in booths exhibited the changeful and unsettled nature of earthly things (see Heb. xi. 9). This fact is obvious; yet we need to be reminded of it. (3) The Hebrews dwelling happily in Canaan were not to forget the humble state of their fathers. Prosperity leads us to forget the day of humility; therefore this Divine institution recurring annually to counteract that tendency. In the review of the barbarity of our ancestors, we may feel more grateful to God for the blessings of civilization. 3. *It was to be a yearly national harvest thanksgiving.* (1) This is here specified in the note of time, viz. "when ye have gathered in the fruit of the land" (ver. 39). The vintage as well as the harvest was then gathered in (see Exod. xxxiv. 22; Deut. xvi. 13). The goodness with which God crowns the year should ever be celebrated by us with grateful hearts. (2) In Exodus the Feast of Tabernacles is called the Feast of Ingathering (xxiii. 16; xxxiv. 22). Thus viewed, it was an anticipation of the Resurrection. The general resurrection is that final ingathering at the end of the world's great year, of which the resurrection of Christ was the firstfruit (1 Cor. xv. 20). (3) This thanksgiving was on the fifteenth day of the seventh month, five days after the Day of Atonement, on which the people had afflicted their souls. The joys of salvation follow upon the sorrows of repentance. The joys of the Resurrection rise out of the horrors of Calvary.

II. THE MODE OF ITS CELEBRATION. 1. *It began and ended with a holy convocation.* (1) The first day, perhaps the fourteenth day of the seventh month, the eve of the feast, was kept as a sabbath from servile work. God should be served in our everyday employments; yet must there be cessation from those employments for his more especial service. Great importance is attached to social worship in Holy Scripture. (2) The eighth day also was a sabbath. This was distinguished as "that great day of the

feast" (see John vii. 37). Upon it the full round of sacrifices were offered (ver. 37). On this day also the people of God returned to their houses, and so celebrated their entrance into Canaan after the toils of the wilderness, and anticipated the rest of heaven. The freedom from servile work on this day showed that at the last day all toil will terminate in the glorious rest of eternity. (3) This was the day on which "Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst," etc. (John vii. 37, 38). The occasion appears to have been that of the priest's pouring out as a libation water which he had drawn from the pool of Siloam in a golden flagon. This ceremony was not prescribed in the Law. Jesus calls off attention from human ceremonies to himself. 2. *On the fifteenth day they gathered the boughs for their booths* (ver. 40). (1) This employment had its obvious economic use. They needed the shelter which their tabernacles afforded. (2) But there was a religious import in what they did; and the trees were emblematical. The thick shady trees, such as the oak or beech, afforded shelter and protection, and suggested the protection and shelter of the covenant of God. The "palm" was an emblem of victory (Rev. vii. 9). The "willows of the brook" represented the thriving condition of the happy (Isa. xliv. 4). The olive was a symbol of peace (see Neh. viii. 15). When Jesus proved himself to be "the Resurrection and the Life" by his miracle upon Lazarus, the people acknowledged it by the boughs of trees (John xii. 13). 3. *Sacrifices were offered which were reduced in number each succeeding day.* (1) (For the account of the sacrifices, see Numb. xxix. 12—38.) (2) Could the reduction in the number be intended to foreshow that the typical sacrifices were destined to vanish away?

Jacob seems to have anticipated this feast on his entering into Canaan (see Gen. xxiii. 17). Anticipations of the Law, as well as of the gospel, are often seen in the history of the patriarchs.

After the plague upon the enemies of Jerusalem in the last days of the Gentiles, the remnant will turn to the Lord, and keep the Feast of Tabernacles (see Zech. xiv. 16). The gospel teaches us now to go out to Christ without the camp.—J. A. M.

**Vers. 4—8.—The influence of sacred recollections.** The great festival of the Passover derived all its meaning from one memorable historic scene. It annually recalled one event of surpassing interest, and, by so doing, it impressed all susceptible souls with those leading truths to which God called Israel to bear its living testimony. We look at—

I. **THE SPECIAL SCENE WHICH THIS FEAST COMMEMORATED, AND THE INFLUENCE IT WAS FITTED TO EXERT.** What a night in Hebrew history that night of the Lord's Passover! What false confidence in every Egyptian, what agitated hearts and trembling hopes in every Hebrew, home! With what solemn awe, and yet with what thrilling expectation, did their forefathers in the land of bondage partake of that strange meal! With what eager carefulness did they see that the saving blood-stream marked the lintels of the door which would shut in their dear ones! And what a morning on the morrow! What joyous congratulations in each Hebrew home when they *all* met, in life and health, on that memorable march! And what terrible consternation, what wild cries of anguish and remorse in those Egyptian houses where the angel of death had *not* passed by, but had struck his fearful stroke! It was the hour of Jehovah's most signal interposition; it was the hour of national redemption. They might well remember it "in all their dwellings through all their generations." This festival recalled the scene and also the deliverance to which it immediately led. And the influence on the minds of all who observed it, both parents and children, was, or surely should have been: 1. To strengthen their attachment to one another. There was danger, with the distribution into tribes, and with the Jordan cutting off two tribes and a half from the rest, that their national unity might be lost, and thus the distinctiveness for which they were called into being disappear. These common, sacred memories would help to bind them together and to keep them one. 2. To preserve their allegiance to their Divine Deliverer. These sacred recollections must excite (1) a sense of deepest obligation; (2) a corresponding feeling of profound gratitude for such signal mercy; (3) a consequent renewal of their consecration of themselves to Jehovah's service; and especially (4) a determination to live that life of purity and separateness from heathen iniquity of which the "unleavened bread" spoke daily to their minds.

II. **NATIONAL MERCIES WHICH WE HAVE RECEIVED FROM GOD AND THE INFLUENCE**

THESE SHOULD EXERT ON US. We are apt to celebrate the greatness of our country with too little reference in our minds to the special favours we have received from God. The separation, through geological processes, of our land from the continent; the store of treasure laid up for our use beneath the surface; the mingling of races resulting in our strong English character; the upraising of mighty and godly men (Alfred, Wickliffe, Tindale, Wesley, etc.), who have wrought great things for us; the effectual and lasting deliverance of our land from the bonds and corruptions of Rome; the security of religious freedom; the rise and growth of the missionary and, subsequently, the evangelistic spirit, etc. These things and such things as these are national mercies, which we should frequently recall; and, remembering them, we should (1) guard against national boastfulness, as if our "right hand" had done everything; (2) cultivate a sense of national obligation, with its accompaniment of reverent gratitude; and especially (3) realize that we are what we are in order that we may bear witness to God's truth, and extend the kingdom of Jesus Christ.

III. SPECIAL INDIVIDUAL MERCIES WE HAVE RECEIVED AND THE INFLUENCE WE SHOULD GAIN FROM THEIR REMEMBRANCE. Every human life, when it has reached maturity, contains instances of special as well as ordinary loving-kindness from the hand of God. These may be (1) recovery from dangerous illness; or (2) extrication from financial embarrassment; or (3) preservation of some precious life; or (4) deliverance from forming a foolish and fatal friendship, or from the perils attending compulsory association with the wicked; or (5) sense, suddenly or gradually imparted, of the supremacy of sacred things resulting in the acceptance of Christ as Lord and Saviour; or (6) revival from spiritual sloth and backsliding. The remembrance of these calls for (1) humility, (2) gratitude, (3) consecration.—C.

Vers. 9—14.—*Provision and piety.* We have here—

I. THE DIVINE FORETHOUGHT. Jehovah (1) anticipated the religious wants of his people, and made due provision for them. "When ye be come into the land . . . and shall reap the harvest thereof, then ye shall bring," etc. (ver. 10). God has anticipated our spiritual necessities with every provision in the gospel; there will never arise any necessity for which there is not, in Christ Jesus and his salvation, an adequate supply. (2) Anticipated their bodily necessities. He was preparing for them corn and wine and oil in the land whither they went. So God is, through all the months between seed-sowing and harvest, "preparing us corn," providing for our nourishment, and also for our enjoyment. His hand of power is ever working (John v. 17) in anticipation of our wants and wishes.

II. HUMAN PIETY IN RESPONSE. The goodness of God, shown to us through all generations, demands intelligent and devout response. We are reminded by the beautiful act of symbolism here enjoined—the presentation of the first sheaf of the harvest unto the Lord (vera. 10, 11)—that our responsive piety should show itself in: 1. Conscious dependence on God, the Source of all life and strength; the waving of the firstfruits was a clear acknowledgment that the whole came from him and belonged to him. 2. Gratitude to God, the bountiful Benefactor. Undoubtedly this was to be a principal element in the institution; their hearts were to be filled with thankfulness for the harvest then about to be gathered in. There is not less gratitude due to our gracious God for giving us food as the result, in part, of our own labour, skill, intelligence, and patience; there is, in truth, *immeasurably more*, for it is the kindest way of doing the kindest thing; it is a way in which he has regard not only to our physical requirements, but also to our moral and spiritual well-being. 3. Fellowship with God. The meat and drink offerings (ver. 13) spoke of the fellowship of the worshipper with Jehovah himself. We are, as reconciled children, to have communion with the God whom we love, to rejoice in his presence, to sit down at his table. 4. Consecration to God. (1) The burnt offering (ver. 12) pointed to the dedication of themselves to the Lord; and (2) the strict injunction of ver. 14 intimated that they were to bring to the service of Jehovah the first produce of the fertile land he had given them. This is the culmination of true piety, the (1) presentation of ourselves to him as to the One whose we are (Rom. xii. 1; 1 Cor. vi. 19, 20), and (2) bringing the first and the best we have to his holy service (Prov. iii. 9); laying ourselves and our substance on the altar of our Lord.—C.

Vers. 15—22.—*Piety in prosperity.* We often speak of our duty in the day of adversity, of the spirit which true piety will then manifest. It is of equal consequence that we should consider what is its rightful attitude in the hour of prosperity. When the harvest is gathered, the nation is rich; when the fruits of the field are in the garner, the husbandman is safe for another year. The time of harvest may, therefore, stand for the position of prosperity. And these verses may suggest to us that when it is well with us in our outward circumstances there should be—

I. GRATEFUL ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF THE HAND OF GOD. At the Feast of Pentecost two loaves, leavened, of the finest flour, the firstfruits of the wheat harvest, were waved by the priest “for a wave offering unto the Lord.” The successful agriculturist is apt to say to himself, if not to others, “This is the harvest I have grown;” is disposed to congratulate himself on the excellency of his own farming. By this act of waving the presentation loaves, the Hebrew husbandman said, “I have ploughed, and sown, and weeded, and reaped, and ground, and baked, but thou, Lord, hast given the increase; thine was the sun that shone, thine the rains that fell, thine the airs that blew, thine the wondrous power that made the elements of nature work out the germination and growth and ripening of the corn: unto thy Name be the honour and the praise.” Whatever may be the sphere of our activity, the character of our success, this is to be “the spirit of our mind;” we are to be ready to make grateful acknowledgment of the hand of God in all satisfying results.

II. HUMILITY. “Ye shall sacrifice one kid of the goats for a sin offering” (ver. 19). The people of God were, on all occasions, even the most joyful, to own their unworthiness, and to seek the forgiving favour of God. The sin offering must find a place even at the Pentecostal feast. When we are most “glad in the Lord,” we do well to make mention of our frailty, our folly, our imperfection, and to ask that, for our Saviour’s sake, it may be forgiven, and we ourselves be accepted of God.

III. SACRED JOY. With the burnt offering there was to be the accompanying “meat offering, and their drink offerings” (ver. 18). And with the sin offering there were to be offered, “two lambs of the first year for a sacrifice of peace offerings” (ver. 19). Here was a very distinct note of sacred joy. When there is harmony without, there must be songs in the soul, but these should not be without strains of sacred music which will be acceptable in the ear of God. Let the voice of joy be heard in our halls, but let us be glad “before the Lord,” remembering the goodness and realizing the presence of him whose we are and whom we serve.

IV. CONSECRATION. “They shall be for a burnt offering unto the Lord” (ver. 18). There is no time more appropriate than the hour of increase and prosperity to renew our vows unto our God, and rededicate our whole lives to his service.

V. CHARITY. (Ver. 22.) We must remember “the poor and the stranger.” That is an evil and miserable prosperity, unsightly in the esteem of man and hateful in the sight of God, which seeks to wrap itself up in silken folds of selfish enjoyment; that is an honourable and admirable prosperity, blessed of God and man, which has a kindly heart and an open hand for those who are beaten in the battle, for those who are left behind in the race of life.—C.

Vers. 23, 24.—*The summons of God.* The trumpet utters a sound that summons attention from every ear. It is distinct from every other note; it is clear, startling, strong. When God bade his prophets declare his mind to the people he desired them to “blow a trumpet in Zion.” The feast which was distinguished by the blowing of trumpets may have been intended to remind Israel, or may remind us of—

I. THEIR RESPONSIBILITIES UNDER THE LAW. When the sacred music was heard at this festival, the Jews could hardly fail to think of that august occasion, when “there were thunders and lightnings, and a thick cloud upon the mount, and the voice of the trumpet exceeding loud,” etc. (Exod. xix. 16). They would thus realize that they were children of the Law, that they existed as a nation for the very purpose of receiving, preserving, and revealing the Law of the Lord, that they had entered into sacred covenant with Jehovah, that they had a great mission to fulfil. The trumpet was the voice of the Lord, saying to them, “Realize what you are.”

II. THE PRIVILEGES WHICH WERE IMMEDIATELY BEFORE THEM. This was “New Year’s Day” to them: the year was before them; it would be a year during which God

would be speaking to them and they to him. Daily sacrifices would be laid on his altar. Special rites would demand peculiar devotion ; one of these—the most sacred of all—was close at hand ; privilege and opportunity were awaiting them, would meet them with the advancing seasons of the new year on which they had entered ; the trumpet of the Lord said, “ Listen and obey, for God is with you.” The Feast of Trumpets reminds us of—

III. THE MORE GRACIOUS ERA TO WHICH WE BELONG. There was no such overwhelming scene at the inauguration of the gospel as that at the giving of the Law. No “ voice of the trumpet sounding long, and waxing louder and louder,” no “ thunders and lightnings.” The kingdom of God “ came not with observation ; ” “ he did not strive nor cry, nor cause his voice to be heard in the streets.” Yet he “ spake as never man spake ” before, and as man will never speak again, and at the beginning of every year we may, without any trumpets sounding, hear a voice from heaven saying to us, “ This is my beloved Son ; hear ye him.” God summons us to learn of him, and know from him (1) how to be related to himself, (2) the spirit in which we should act to our fellows, and (3) the way to rule our own spirit and regulate our own life. We may also be reminded of—

IV. THE LAST DAY OF THIS DISPENSATION. The day draws on when the “ trump of God ” shall sound, summoning the dead to life, calling the living and the dead to judgment and award (see 1 Cor. xv. 52 ; 1 Thess. iv. 16). At any hour of our life, but especially on any anniversary, when we are reminded of the passage of our probationary life and the oncoming of the day of his appearing, we may well hear the summons of God to prepare for that great day.

“ Great God, what do I see and hear ?

\* \* \* \* \*

The trumpet sounds, the graves restore  
The dead which they contained before.  
Prepare, my soul, to meet him.”

C.

Vers. 33—43.—*Joy before the Lord.* The idea that, under the ancient Law, Israel was a peculiarly severe and gloomy nation, is essentially false. Gravity rather than light-heartedness may indeed have characterized them : they may have had much “ seriousness of soul,” but they were familiar with joy, and sometimes gave themselves up to great and continued gladness of heart. It was radiant sunshine in Israel during the Feast of Tabernacles. The whole engagements of the sacred festival suggest to us—

I. THAT SORROW IS OFTEN FOLLOWED BY JOY, AND THAT SACRED SORROW IS THE SOURCE OF PUREST JOY. It is significant that this Feast of Tabernacles came only five days after the Day of Atonement, the day on which they were commanded to “ afflict their souls ” (see vers. 27, 34). How often does a very small interval divide joy and sorrow ! so checkered are the scenes of our mortal life, that no man in brightest circumstances can ensure to himself five days’ prosperity, and that no man under the darkest cloud need despair of seeing the sun break speedily and shine serenely on his path. And when sorrow is hallowed by reflection, submission, prayer, there is laid the foundation of purest joy. The happiness which is born of submission to the will of God is something which “ satisfies and sanctifies the mind.” It is a joy that lasts.

II. THAT PROSPERITY DOES WELL SOMETIMES TO TURN A BACKWARD LOOK ON THE ADVERSITY IT HAS LEFT BEHIND. (Vers. 40, 42, 43.) It was well for Israel, dwelling in strong and comfortable houses, to spend one week in the year in the “ booths,” which took them back in thought to the tents of the wilderness. When God gives either to a man or to a nation to rise out of obscurity and hardship into prominence and comfort, to pass from spiritual destitution to a state of abounding privilege and opportunity, nothing is more desirable than that he (or it) should occasionally revert to the old days of toil or want, and have his (its) heart filled with thankfulness to him who plants our feet upon the rock, who lifts us up to the high place of prosperity and power.

III. THAT HAPPINESS IS SAFE ONLY WHEN IT IS SANCTIFIED. The Hebrew nation was to “ rejoice before the Lord seven days ” (ver. 40). The heart of the people was to be filled with overflowing gladness, but it was to be poured out “ before the Lord ; ” so it

was safe and salutary. Happiness, success, attaining the height of our hopes,—this is very apt to run into (1) unrestrained mirth, or (2) proud complacency of spirit, or (3) unchristian selfishness. So it becomes a curse to him who should be blessed. Let us take care to "rejoice before the Lord," to turn joy into gratitude, to go with our gladness into the sanctuary of the Lord, to consecrate our substance to his service, to consult his will in the way in which we shall use our power or our opportunity; then will our increase and elevation, of whatever kind it be, prove a blessing, and not a bane to ourselves and to our neighbours.

IV. THAT EARTHLY JOY IS THE JOY OF HAPPY PILGRIMAGE. Our earthly house is but a tabernacle (2 Cor. v. 1); it is to be soon taken down and to give place to a "house in the heavens." We are, as the Hebrew nation, dwelling in booths. This is but a transitory condition; we must not think and act as if it were our "continuing city." Such joy as pilgrims have, who are ever looking forward to a blessedness to come, we may permit ourselves. But alas! for him who "has his reward" here, and looks for none hereafter, whose only heritage is in the "world that passeth away." Well is it for him whose holy happiness is a preparation for, and an anticipation of, the blessedness which is beyond, which abides and abounds for ever.—C.

Vers. 1—44.—*The festivals.* Vers. 1—3, *the sabbath.* The three features of it are: the convocation; the rest from all work; the sabbath of the Lord in their dwellings.

I. The PUBLIC WORSHIP of God is the main reason for the sabbath. "Holy convocation." Necessity that one day should be appointed. Importance of preserving that day of worship from distraction and disturbance. Influence of public worship on the general interests of religion, and therefore on the individual, community, and the world at large.

II. REST. "Ye shall do no work." The physical necessity of an interval of rest. The moral importance of giving opportunity to the higher powers of the nation for free development. The reaction of the sabbath on the working capacity, both by physical recuperation and moral strength. The difference between God's Law and the "gospel of work" preached by many. The secularist empties life of its dignity and glory, and at last sacrifices it to the Molech of this world's necessities and pleasures.

III. The sabbath of God is a SABBATH IN OUR DWELLINGS. Religion sanctifies home life and family affection. Rest in the house of God is rest in the house of man. The law of religion shields all life from injury, and cherishes the glad and happy in the midst of the laborious and troublesome. We should take care that the sabbath at home is both rest and worship, that it is not spent in idleness or even self-gratification, but, being given to God, becomes the more really our own—not by slavish regulation of the hours, but by the spirit of worship pervading all our surroundings and employments. The sanctuary and the home open into one another.—R.

Vers. 4—8.—*The Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread.* This may be regarded as the opening festival of the year, and the closing one was the Feast of Tabernacles; typically representing the life of God's people passing from redemption to restitution. The Jewish sacred year may be taken to represent the progress of Divine grace. The foundation of all is the Passover—redemption, the death of Christ the Paschal Lamb. The main ideas are—

I. All true life resting on the true beginning of peace and rest in the offering up of the Lamb of God for the sins of the world.

II. All true holiness, bread without leaven, pure fruits of man's labour, offered to God, springs out of faith. Morality is an outcome of religion. Reconciliation with God is the beginning of the consecrated life.

III. The Passover, a national celebration, set forth the true strength of the national life, as the life of God in the nation. The world can be renovated only as it is regarded as a world redeemed. Christianity is the only religion adapted to be a universal message to mankind. Hence its catholicity.—R.

Vers. 9—14.—*The first sheaf a wave offering of the harvest.* Festival of firstfruits. May be viewed (1) naturally; (2) typically.

I. The consecration of human life and its results to God. 1. As an expression of thankfulness and praise. 2. As an act of faith and hope.

II. TYPICAL view of the firstfruits. 1. Christ the Firstfruits. In the Resurrection (1 Cor. xv. 20). Of humanity as renewed and restored to perfection. 2. The true doctrine of election, the firstfruits the pledge of the harvest. Israel separated from the world for the hope of the world. 3. Individually. Our present life consecrated is a pledge of future glory. We shall reap hereafter the full harvest of redemption. Profession and dedication. The wave offering, "before the Lord" and before his people, in the sanctuary; as a sacrifice; in the covenant.—R.

Vers. 15—22.—*Day of Pentecost* (cf. Acts ii.).

I. THE BLENDING TOGETHER OF THE NATURAL AND SPIRITUAL LIVES. The harvest of the earthly labour, the harvest of grace.

II. INTIMATE CONNECTION BETWEEN THE TWO FESTIVALS OF PASSOVER AND PENTECOST. The seven weeks', that is, week of weeks', interval, pointing to sacred bond between them. The fruits of righteousness are by Jesus Christ. Pentecostal grace flows from redemption as a fountain, as summer from spring, as harvest from seed-time.

III. HISTORICAL FULFILMENT of the idea of Pentecost in the outpouring of the Spirit, the ingathering of the firstfruits of the Christian Church, the beginning of the new life and new joy of the world. Christ arising and bringing forth fruit. Mingling together of the wave loaves and the bloody sacrifices, typical of the union of the work of Christ and the work of the Spirit. The sabbath in the harvest, the rest in the work, the true reward of life in the enjoyment of God. The mission of Christianity to the poor and the stranger. Universal joy. All the field brings forth blessed results for all the world.—R.

Vers. 23—25.—*The Feast of Trumpets*. "A sabbath, a memorial, a holy convocation." Probably recalling the giving of the Law from Mount Sinai. Therefore typical of the *proclamation of the gospel*, which is the new law of love.

I. The people of God unite together to spread the sound of the gospel in the world.

II. They rejoice in it. It is a festival—a work which is sabbatical.

III. It is immediately connected with the great Day of Atonement, and the proclamation will be no uncertain sound, but a distinct announcement of the saving truth set forth in the sacrificial death of Christ.—R.

Vers. 26—32.—*The great Day of Atonement* (see on ch. xvi. 29—34).—R.

Vers. 33—44.—*The Feast of Tabernacles* (cf. Neh. viii. 17; Zech. xiv. 16).

I. PRAISE FOR ACCOMPLISHED REDEMPTION AND THE BOUNTEOUS GIFTS OF PROVIDENCE. Reminiscences of the wilderness life. Fact that Israel neglected the feast from Joshua to Nehemiah, even in the time of great national prosperity in Solomon's reign, very instructive, pointing to ingratitude and unbelief. The religious life and the natural life blended. The joy of praise binding families together, and so nations and the world.

II. The symbolical meaning of the feast—THE GLORY OF ISRAEL AND THE ULTIMATE RESTITUTION OF ALL THINGS. The prophecy of Zechariah (xiv. 16) not to be taken literally, otherwise its significance is narrowed; but as a spiritual anticipation of the enlargement of the true Church until it shall embrace the world. The gospel invites men to rejoice in the Lord.

III. The feast on earth—A FORETASTE OF THE HIGHER LIFE OF HEAVEN. Dwelling in booths—temporary, frail, withering, yet by their nature, as pleasant places of shadow, pointing to the rest that remains for the people of God. The wilderness life leads on to the life of Canaan; the earthly festival to the heavenly; the frail tabernacle to the "city of habitations," "having foundations," etc.—R.

Ver. 4.—*Religious festivals*. This chapter has been termed, from its contents, the Calendar of Feasts. Underneath much that has been abolished by the gospel, we can trace principles and truths of permanent application, invested with interest for the Christian as well as the Jewish Church. Surface views are of little worth; if not misleading, they are at best transitory in nature.

I. TRUE RELIGION HAS ITS FESTIVALS. The word rendered "feasts" in the text means

“fixed times;” but in ver. 6 “feast” is the translation of a word that signifies rejoicing, whose expression is dancing or processions. By their devotion to Jehovah, the Israelites were not to be continually shadowed in gloom, nor deprived of the legitimate mirth that attached even to heathen celebrations. Only they were to be the “feasts of the Lord,” in his honour—not to the deification of Baalim or Ashtaroth. “Rejoice in the Lord” is our privilege as Christians, and to realize every privilege is also a duty. It is time that the popular idea were corrected which dissociates a profession of religion from all that savours of high enjoyment.

II. THE CHARACTERISTIC OF A FESTIVAL IS THE GATHERING TOGETHER OF GOD'S PEOPLE. “Convocation” gives the force of the original—it is “a place of calling.” Solitary joy does not constitute a feast of Jehovah. Just as some are prone to neglect private meditation, so do others slight the public communion of saints. The chief promise of the Lord's presence is granted to those “assembling” in his name. We ought to make an effort to attend all the festivals of the Church; we are called to them, and are guilty of disobedience if, without reasonable excuse, we do not respond. Numbers exert an exhilarating influence upon the mind; a large meeting is generally inspiring to all concerned. The gatherings, sometimes held apart from the tabernacle in accordance with the injunctions of this chapter, developed into the worship of the synagogue, the model of our services upon the Lord's day.

III. HOLINESS IS THE PURPOSE, AND SHOULD BE THE RULING FEATURE, OF THESE GATHERINGS. They are termed “holy” convocations, and are thus distinguished from the wild orgies of heathendom. Neither Roundhead austerity nor Cavalier licentiousness is here designed. Especially should we aim in our modern religious meetings at edification; not indulging to excess in humour and levity, but preserving decorum whilst rising to intelligent, godly enthusiasm. By such a time of sacred gladness we shall prove the truth of the utterance, “The joy of the Lord is your strength.” The apostle intimates (1 Cor. xi. 10) that our behaviour in Church assemblies should be governed by a knowledge of the fact that the angels are spectators. Let our august visitors be treated with respect. So shall these meetings prove preparations for above, for the general assembly and Church of the Firstborn, and the innumerable hosts of angels.

IV. THE FESTIVAL INVOLVES ABSTINENCE FROM SERVILE WORK. (See ver. 7.) The usual occupations are renounced, and rest, not of indolence, but of spiritual activity, is enjoyed. The good that thereby results to the physical and spiritual frame can hardly be overestimated. Energy and time are not wasted, but improved. It is well that a man should not be always trammelled by the claims of business, but discern that there are other obligations it is incumbent on him to discharge. The chain that never leaves the neck will eat itself into the flesh, and liberty become impossible. If the head be continually bent towards the earth, it will become a matter of utmost difficulty to raise it to behold the heavens. To work at our worldly calling, to minister to the wants of the body, is not the only or the noblest task we are expected to perform; the soul has its rights and needs, and Jehovah his prerogatives.

V. FESTIVAL GATHERINGS ARE OF REGULAR RECURRENCE. “Which ye shall proclaim in their seasons.” What is irregularly attended to is liable to be overlooked; what is anticipated can be prepared for. The weekly observance of a day of holy convocation prevents every pretext of forgetfulness and insufficient notice, and reminds us, in addition, of the flight of time. The methodical man parcels out his days; and a regard for order is evident in all the precepts of Scripture.—S. R. A.

Vers. 10, 11.—*The beginning of harvest.* Advantage was taken of the long sojourn in the wilderness to promulgate and instruct the people in the Law, that they might be ready to execute its commandments as soon as full opportunity was afforded by a residence in a settled country. To dwell upon such future observances could not but strengthen the faith of the people in God's intention to bring them eventually into the promised land. Of all the anticipations connected with that land, the most pleasing was the prospect of seeing the golden grain standing in the fields inviting the reaper's sickle.

I. THE RECOGNITION OF GOD AS THE GIVER OF ALL GOOD GIFTS. 1. *Here he is recognized as the God of providence, whose kind hand enriches man with the fruits of LEVITICUS.*

earth, causing the seed to germinate, and perfecting and ripening it with sun, air, and rain. Israel thus rebuked the folly of surrounding nations, who deified the earth as a personal goddess; and the conceptions of the modern materialist who refuses to see in nature any trace of an overruling Deity, and of the pantheist who identifies God with his works, may be similarly reproved. And if the blessings received from Providence are to be acknowledged, surely the same argument will apply to all the many favours, temporal and spiritual, that stream upon us as the children of God. In fact, what have we of intellectual, physical, or propertied endowment that did not proceed from him? 2. *Recognized by the congregation as a whole.* Family, corporate, national religion is distinct in a sense from individual worship, and God may honour the one as such apart from the particular merits of the other. The entire body ought, however, to resemble the component units; otherwise there is felt to be an incongruity that mocks the Being whom we intend to magnify. The Americans have shown that, apart from what is called State religion, there may be hearty national recognition of God. 3. *The general does not exclude the personal acknowledgment of God's goodness.* In ch. ii. 14 are found regulations respecting the presentation of free-will individual firstfruit offerings. The service of the sanctuary should stimulate and not serve as a substitute for private prayer and praise. Let the congregational dedication be seconded by a personal self-surrender to the glory of God.

II. THE METHOD OF ACKNOWLEDGMENT. 1. *An offering brought to the Lord, viz. a sheaf of barley, which is "waved" by the priest, the symbolical act indicative of surrender of property to God.* By returning a portion of what was originally bestowed, God's proprietorship and man's stewardship are signified in fitting manner. Each Church and family should pay its tithes to the Lord, separating some of its members to religious work. 2. *Such an offering may provide for the support of God's appointed servants.* This sheaf was not consumed upon the altar, but was for the benefit of the priests. Those who by reason of exclusive devotion to the altar cannot find leisure to sow and reap, must be remembered by the people in whose behalf they labour. To assist the servants of Christ is to render help to the Master himself. Let the wealthy in the receipt of their dividends think upon the men who are their representatives in Christian effort. The division of labour must not allow one field of industry to be entirely isolated from the rest. 3. *Other offerings naturally accompany the particular presentation.* The one food reminds of other blessings, and so, besides the firstfruit sheaf, there are brought a burnt offering, a meat offering, and a drink offering, constituting a festal sacrifice. One gift prepares the way for another, opens the door so that a presentation of a different kind may follow. He who sets apart a portion of time for God is not likely to stop there, but will contribute money and influence likewise.

III. THE PRIORITY OF GOD'S CLAIM TO HONOUR. 1. *It precedes our own enjoyment.* No bread, nor parched corn, nor green ears must be tasted till Jehovah has been duly acknowledged as the bountiful Giver. The rent must be paid ere we can settle down to comfortable possession of the house. Men think they can without impropriety reverse this order, attending first to their own needs and pleasures, and then to God's requirements. In two ways they err—they dishonour their Maker, and they fail to hallow the enjoyment of their daily food and privileges by the happy consciousness that a portion has been previously dedicated to God. To acknowledge our indebtedness is to send us back rejoicing to our dwellings. 2. *It is not right to wait until the whole amount of blessing has been reaped.* At the very beginning of harvest this ceremony occurs, consecrating the harvest toil, ensuring the favour of God upon the remainder. Men who delay an offering until they know the exact amount of their savings, are likely to find the total less than they hoped. It is well to give in faith, seeing quite sufficient reason already to evoke a testimony of gratitude. "Honour the Lord with thy substance, and with the firstfruits of all thine increase: so shall thy barns be filled with plenty, and thy presses shall burst out with new wine." For the first convert in a place that seems teeming with promise of fruitfulness, we would at once give thanks. Ere the multitudes of happy dead can be raised and gathered into the heavenly garner, Jesus Christ is risen and become the Firstfruits of them that sleep. His appearance before God as the Perfect Offering guarantees an ample blessed harvest.—S. R. A.

Vers. 40—43.—*The Feast of Tabernacles.* There were three great festivals for the Israelites, the dates for which were plainly marked, and at which times it behoved the males of the nation as far as possible to be present at the sanctuary. It is the last of these we are about to consider. The regulations for its observance were enunciated in fullest detail. Were not the people thus reminded that they assisted in the celebration of the ceremonies of a royal court? The Christian Church has its festivals, prominent among which are its gatherings on the Lord's day, and the observance of the Lord's Supper. Much of what can be said with reference to the Israelitish feasts is applicable also to the latter.

I. THIS WAS THE MOST JOYOUS OF THE FESTIVALS. “Ye shall rejoice before the Lord your God.” 1. See *God's delight in the happiness of his people.* He loves to witness their rejoicing. Religion was never intended to be synonymous with gloom or moroseness. 2. *This was the crowning festival of the year,* and therefore ought to be its climax of joy. For the child of God better days are ever in store; he need never pine for the past to return; each festival shall surpass the preceding. Jesus keeps the best wine till the last; not so with the world's pleasures. 3. It took place five days after the solemn Day of Atonement, when the national sin was purged, and Israel's communion with its God re-established. *To confess sin and obtain pardon is the fitting preparation for gladness of heart.* No man who has not experienced the feeling of relief from the burden of guilt and the emotion caused by restoration to his heavenly Father's favour, knows the meaning of real joy. Compared with this the delights of sense and intellect are flavourless. 4. *Joy reaches its highest expression in the presence of God.* “Rejoice before the Lord,” even the holy righteous God who searches the heart and tries the reins. We may without pride know that we have done what was right, and that the Being of beings approves our conduct and graces the festival with the light of his countenance. There is none of the secret misgiving that attends sinful banquets, where the laugh is hollow and the gaiety forced, from a conviction that conscience is being silenced and moral law violated. Cf. the rejoicing of the people, and the terror of Adonijah and his guests (1 Kings i. 40, 49). David danced for glee before the Lord when the sacred ark was brought into the city of David. “Rejoice, O daughter of Zion, for thy king cometh unto thee.” We would fain have the children glad when it is said, “Let us go unto the house of the Lord.”

II. THIS WAS A FESTIVAL OF GRATITUDE FOR RECENT BLESSINGS. 1. Another name for it was *the Feast of Ingathering.* All the produce of the ground had been garnered, the Lord had blessed them in all their increase—corn, oil, and wine; daily food and luxuries abounded; the booths were constructed of fruit trees and leafy palms. God's bounteous bestowment was acknowledged. Spiritual and temporal mercies had enriched the people and evoked manifestations of thanksgiving. So visibly dependent is man upon God for the germinating and maturing of the grain and fruit, that a harvest thanksgiving seems peculiarly appropriate, and again at the storing of the harvest, when the work for the year is practically ended, a festival is of evident fitness. The compassions of the Lord, “new every morning,” furnish ample matter for devout meditation and praise. 2. *This feature of the festival was a reason why all should share in it,* not only the wealthy, high-born Israelites, but the strangers, the fatherless, the widow, and the poor (Deut. xvi. 14). God allows his sun to shine and rain to descend upon all, and he expects those who receive his lavish gifts to invite others to participate in the enjoyment thereof. Anticipating our Lord's directions to summon to a feast the poor and maimed and blind, the Israelites were accustomed to “send portions to them for whom nothing is prepared.” Selfish exclusion was thus prevented, and universal rejoicing made possible. 3. *An offering to God from each was essential.* “They shall not appear before the Lord empty; every man shall give as he is able” (Deut. xvi. 17). Speech and sentiment without deeds are rightly deemed insincere. It is true of all converts from heathendom that when they give of their substance to God we may infer that they have first given him their hearts. The priests and Levites were in part supported by these national free-will presentations. If we esteem the Master, we shall treat his servants well for his sake.

III. THIS WAS A COMMEMORATION OF FORMER BLESSINGS. During seven days the Israelites dwelt in booths made of green boughs to remind them of the days when they sojourned in the wilderness (ver. 43). 1. *Previous experience may well be remembered.*

If it pass into oblivion, its lessons have not been graven on the mind, and our state has not proved the discipline it was designed to be. Stand, O believer, upon the mount of present station, and survey the path with all its windings by which you have ascended to this lofty summit. Such a review will be profitable in the extreme, it will produce deepened humility and thankfulness. Keil says, “the recollection of privation and want can never be an occasion of joy.” Surely he forgets the Latin line, “*haec olim meminisse juvabit.*” Contrast ever heightens joy, a danger successfully surmounted is one of the most pleasing of memories. 2. *The exhibition of God's protecting grace and love demands particular recollection.* Not the might and resources of the Israelites, but the watchful, provident care of Jehovah, had led them safely through the desert. He had been to them “a booth for a shadow in the daytime from the heat, and for a place of refuge, and for a covert from storm and from rain” (Isa. iv. 6). The honour of God was concerned in having a permanent memorial of Israel's stay in the wilderness, and this institution was adapted to preserve the continued confidence of the people in him and consequent freedom from boastful self-assertion. In many ways, “the joy of the Lord is our strength.” 3. *The deliverances wrought for our forefathers in olden days should excite gratitude to God in our breasts.* Can we recall unmoved the triumphs of the early Christians, or the heroism which God's Spirit enabled martyred Protestants to evince? The wonders of our age become the heirlooms of the ages that follow.

**CONCLUSION.** The sacrifice of Jesus Christ commemorated in the Lord's Supper was the Passover of the Church; the descent of the Spirit at Pentecost marked the era of the Church's Feast of Weeks; the Feast of Tabernacles yet waits its due counterpart, when the elect shall be gathered into the kingdom from every land, to celebrate the cessation of earthly toil, to exult in the complete removal of sinful stain, and to enter upon the undimmed, undying gladness of the eternal sabbath. Not one of God's people shall be missing through illness or distance of abode, and a retrospect of the pilgrimage of earth shall enhance the bliss of heaven.—S. R. A.

### EXPOSITION.

#### CHAPTER XXIV.

A connection between ch. xxiii. and ch. xxiv. 1—9 is found by Keil in the fact that the oil for the holy lamps and the shewbread were offerings of the people, a sacrificial gift with which Israel was to serve the Lord continually. “The offering of oil, therefore, for the preparation of the candlestick, and that of fine flour for making the loaves to be placed before Jehovah, formed part of the service in which Israel sanctified its life and labour to the Lord its God, not only at the appointed festal periods, but every day; and the law is very appropriately appended to the sanctification of the sabbaths and feast days prescribed in ch. xxiii.” But it is better to consider the whole chapter parenthetical between chs. xxiii. and xxv., the first part having been suggested by the list of days on which holy convocations were to be held, because it is connected with the temple or tabernacle service; the second part (the blasphemer's death) being inserted because it chronologically happened shortly

after the law as to holy convocations and festivals had been pronounced.

**Vers. 1—4.**—The ordinance on the lamps contained in the first three verses is repeated from Exod. xxvii. 20. The oil to be used for the lamps was to be pure oil olive, that is, oil made of picked berries, without any intermixture of dust or twigs; and it was to be beaten instead of “pressed,” because when the berries were crushed in the olive-press, small portions of them became mixed with and discoloured the oil, which was, therefore, less pure than when the fruit was simply beaten and then left to drain. The lamps were to burn continually; that is, from evening to morning every night. Without the vail of the testimony, in the tabernacle of the congregation; that is, in the holy place, as distinct from the holy of holies. Aaron, either personally or by his sons (see Exod. xxvii. 21), was to dress the lamps every morning, and light them every evening (Exod. xxx. 7). The lamps were upon the seven-branched candlestick, which is called the pure candlestick, because made of gold. The light of the seven-branched candlestick symbolized the enlightening power of the Holy Spirit, which should illumine God's Church (Zech. iv. 2—6; Rev. 1, 12, 20). **Vers. 5—9.**—The shewbread, or bread of

the face, that is, of the presence, was to be made of fine flour, that is, of wheat, and to consist of twelve cakes or loaves, to represent the twelve tribes of Israel, each loaf containing upward of six pounds of flour. The loaves were placed upon the pure table before the Lord; that is, on the golden table of shewbread within the sanctuary—which stood not far from the vail which partitioned off the holy of holies—toward the north, as the candlestick was toward the south. The loaves were set, not, probably, in two rows, six on a row, as they could have hardly stood in that position on so small a table as the table of shewbread (which was only three feet by one foot and a half), but *in piles, six in a pile*. Upon them, or more probably between the two piles, were placed two vials or cups filled with frankincense (Josephus, 'Ant.', iii. 7, 6). The shewbread was renewed every sabbath day, with much ceremony. "Four priests," says the Mishna, "enter, two of them carrying the piles of bread, and two of them the cups of incense. Four priests had gone in before them, two to take off the two old piles of shewbread, and two to take off the cups of incense. Those who brought in the new stood at the north side facing southwards; those who took away the old, at the south side, facing northwards. One party lifted off and the other put on, the hands of one being over against the hands of the other, as it is written, *Thou shalt set upon the*

table bread of the Passover always before me" ('Men.', xi. 7). The loaves that were removed were delivered to the priests for their consumption within the tabernacle, the whole quantity amounting to seventy-five pounds of bread per week. It was this bread which, in the pressure of necessity, Ahimelech gave to David and his men (1 Sam. xxi. 4—6). At the same time that the old loaves were changed, the frankincense was burned on the golden altar of incense for a memorial, even an offering made by fire unto the Lord. There is nothing in Scripture to prove whether the loaves were leavened or unleavened. As being the meat offering of the tabernacle, we should expect them to be unleavened, like the meat offering of the court, but there was a reason why the meat offering of the court should be unleavened, which did not operate in the case of the shewbread. A part of the ordinary meat offering had to be burnt on the altar of burnt sacrifice; therefore it could not be leavened, because no leaven might be burned on the altar; but the shewbread was not burnt on any altar, and consequently it need not for that reason be unleavened. The two Pentecostal loaves, which were offered to the Lord by waving instead of burning, were leavened. The probabilities derived from Scripture appear to be equally strong on either side. Josephus states that they were unleavened ('Ant.', iii. 6, 6; 10, 7).

### HOMILETICS.

Vers. 1—9.—The lamps of the seven-branched candlestick burnt throughout the whole night in the tabernacle; and the shewbread was constantly set forth upon the golden table. They may be taken to symbolize: 1. The constant illumination vouchsafed by God to his Church through the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. 2. The spiritual food constantly supplied by him in his Church to those who come in faith to have their wants supplied.

I. **ILLUMINATION BY THE SPIRIT WAS PROMISED BY CHRIST.** "The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you" (John xiv. 26). "It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you. . . . When he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth" (John xvi. 7—13).

II. **THE FULFILMENT OF THE PROMISE COMMENCED ON THE DAY OF PENTECOST.** "Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear" (Acts ii. 33).

III. **THE ILLUMINATION IS PERMANENT THROUGH THE INSTRUMENTALITY OF A PERMANENT MINISTRY.** "When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. . . . And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the Body of Christ" (Eph. iv. 8—12).

IV. **CHRIST ABIDES BY HIS SPIRIT IN THE MIDST OF THE SEVEN GOLDEN CANDLESTICKS.** "I saw seven golden candlesticks; and in the midst of the seven candlesticks one like

unto the Son of man" (Rev. i. 12, 13). "These things saith he that holdeth the seven stars in his right hand, who walketh in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks" (Rev. ii. 1).

V. ANY BRANCH OF THE CANDLESTICK WHOSE LIGHT IS EXTINGUISHED WILL BE REMOVED. "Remember therefore from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do the first works; or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will remove thy candlestick out of his place, except thou repent" (Rev. ii. 5).

2. I. CHRIST IS THE SPIRITUAL FOOD OF HIS CHURCH. "Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Moses gave you not that bread from heaven; but my Father giveth you the true Bread from heaven. For the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world. Then said they unto him, Lord, evermore give us this bread. And Jesus said unto them, I am the Bread of Life: he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst. . . . The Jews then murmured at him, because he said, I am the Bread which came down from heaven. . . . Jesus therefore answered and said unto them, Murmur not among yourselves. . . . I am the living Bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever: and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world" (John vi. 32—51).

II. CHRIST'S SACRIFICE UPON THE CROSS SUPPLIES THE FOOD ON WHICH BY FAITH WE ARE TO FEED. "We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle" (Heb. xiii. 10).

III. ONE MEANS OF OUR THUS FEEDING UPON HIM IS THE SACRAMENT OF THE LORD'S SUPPER. "And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins" (Matt. xxvi. 26—28).

IV. HE SUPPLIES THE NEEDS OF THOSE THAT THIRST AS WELL AS OF THOSE THAT HUNGER. "I will give unto him that is athirst of the fountain of the water of life freely" (Rev. xxi. 6). "Let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely" (Rev. xxii. 17).

V. HE FEEDS HIS PEOPLE NOT ONLY BY SACRAMENTS BUT BY THE WORD OF GOD PREACHED BY HIS MINISTERS. "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God" (Matt. iv. 4). "Take heed therefore unto yourselves" (the Ephesian elders), "and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of God" (Acts xx. 28). "He gave some, pastors and teachers" (Eph. iv. 11). "He saith unto him, Feed my lambs. . . . He saith unto him, Feed my sheep. . . . Jesus saith unto him, Feed my sheep" (John xxi. 15—17). "The elders which are among you I exhort. . . . Feed the flock of God which is among you" (1 Pet. v. 1, 2).

#### HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

*Everlasting light.* Ch. xxiv. 1—4; cf. Rev. i. 12—20; also Ps. xliii. 8. The holy place, like the most holy, had no windows, and consequently required illumination. This was secured by the golden candlestick, with its seven lamps. These were to be always emitting some light. If all the seven lamps were not lit during the daytime, one or two of them were. The idea carried out was that there should be in God's sanctuary *everlasting light*.

That the candlestick was taken as the symbol of God's *truth* is evident from Ps. xliii. 3, "Oh send out thy light, even thy truth: let them lead me; let them bring me unto thy holy hill, and to thy tabernacles." In fact, God's essential nature as light was exhibited by the Shechinah in the holy of holies; then in the golden candlestick, we have the light *mediated* in the holy place in such a way as would suffice for the illumination of the ordinary priests at their sacred ministries. God's arrangement, therefore, for the dissemination of truth in this dark world of ours is what the golden candlestick is intended to convey. Rev. i. 12—20 throws clear light on the symbol. The Churches

established in the world by God are the lamps (*λυχνίαι*) which he intends to shine till the dawn of the eternal day.

I. NOTICE THE UNITY OF ALL TRUE CHURCHES. For the seven lamps were united in the one candlestick, just as all true Churches are one in Christ. There is no incorporation necessarily implied, but this is also to be encouraged by every legitimate means. If unity in Christ be a real thing, it will show itself in some way or another before men.

II. THE OIL FOR THE LIGHT WAS TO BE BEATEN. The olives were to be placed in a mortar and beaten, and then the oil which flowed off without further pressure, the purest possible, was to be used for the light. God's truth is communicated to men in such a form that they must diligently co-operate with God before the benefit is obtained. No careless handling of truth will suffice. We must beat the olives well before we get the needful oil. Ministers must be diligent in their preparations, Christians of all classes must "search the Scriptures," if the requisite oil for the light is to be obtained. God might rain down oil from heaven, and save us a heap of trouble, but he would rather put it into the olive berries, and ask us to pound it out from these. Similarly, he has put in his Word "things hard to be understood," as well as things that are simple, to the end that we should diligently study it and get the sacred oil.

III. THE WICK HAD TO BE CAREFULLY TRIMMED, AND WHEN NEEDFUL SNUFFED. It was the high priest's special duty, in which, however, the other priests assisted. And is this not to indicate the work undertaken by Jesus Christ, who as High Priest walked among the golden lamps? (Rev. i. 12). A beautiful parallel passage is presented in Matt. xii. 20, where it is said, "smoking flax [i.e. 'a wick'—*λίνον*] shall he not quench, till he send forth judgment unto victory." There may be pain in the process often by which our High Priest gets his wicks trimmed and luminous, but there is also mercy and tenderness ineffable. How often does he hold his hands around the expiring wick, and blow it gently into a flame again! Blessed are his dealings, when as the result his people, and especially his ministers, are made to shine as "lights in the world." Regarding the snuffers in this connection, we may quote an old and quaint writer. "The Lord," says Weemse, "commanded to make snuffers of pure gold for the snuffing of the lamps, and snuff-dishes to receive the snuff; he would have the snuff taken from the light, to signify that he would have the Word kept in sincerity and purity; and he would have the snuffers of gold, to teach them to be blameless and holy, who are censurers and correctors of others; and he would have the snuff-dishes of gold, to teach them that the covering of the offences of their brethren was a most excellent thing."

IV. THE LAMPS WERE LIT FROM THE ALTAR. That is to say, it was *Divine* fire which made the oil luminous. God is light, from him cometh all real illumination. So it is only when the Saviour baptizes men with fire, it is only when the Holy Ghost lights up the sacred page, it is only when the Spirit co-operates with the Word, that the truth appears in its brightness unto men. An earnest ministry is that which gives itself to prayer and to the ministry of the Word, prayer calling down the Divine fire which makes the entrance of the Word give light. Then may the lamps be expected to burn brightly and to light up the night of the world till the day dawns.—R. M. E.

*The weekly offering.* Ch. xxiv. 5-9; cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 2; 1 Tim. v. 17, 18. Along with the everlasting light from the golden candlestick, there was to be in the holy place a presentation of bread, which was made on the sabbath and lay before the Lord on the prescribed table all the week, becoming the property and support of the priests when they brought the fresh loaves on the succeeding sabbath. The loaves were to be twelve in number, to correspond to the tribes of Israel; they were arranged in two piles, upon the top of which there was placed a little incense, which was duly fired and thus ascended to heaven. The incense sanctified the offering. Now this "bread of the face," as it was called, bread intended for the Divine presence, was the dedication on the part of the people of the staple of life, first to God, and secondly to the support of his priests. As previously observed, it was the perpetual meat offering. Here it is interesting to notice it as a "weekly offering" prescribed in the Old Testament economy. What Paul urges on the Corinthians (1 Cor. xvi. 2), "Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come," is the exact counterpart of the shewbread. The Lord's day is to be the time for a weekly offering for the support of his cause.

I. WE ARE SURELY TAUGHT HERE HOW SYSTEMATIC OUR OFFERINGS SHOULD BE. There should be a regularity about them like the return of the holy day. It is only when this periodicity characterizes them that the Lord's cause is likely to be properly supported. A weekly offering is much more likely to be successful than a monthly, or quarterly, or annual offering. Liberality is to be a weekly exercise, like the ordinances of our holy religion.

II. OUR OFFERINGS SHOULD BE SANCTIFIED BY THE INCENSE OF PRAYER. This is only to say that liberality should be a religious act, part of our religious service. Then are we likely to be conscientious in discharging our obligations, when we carry our gifts into the presence of God. As Jesus stood over against the treasury in the temple, and saw the extraordinary liberality connected with the widow's two mites, so is he watching our offerings at his shrine, noticing whether they are generous and cheerful or given with a grudge, observing whether they are perfumed with incense or rendered obnoxious by worldliness and ostentation. It will tend to purify our liberality to envelop it in prayer.

III. GOD'S OFFICERS SHOULD BE REGARDED AS RECEIVING THEIR SUPPORT FROM HIS TABLE. That is to say, they are to be regarded as receiving their support from God, not directly from the people. It is this element of sanctity in the service of liberality which saves the dignity of the Lord's officers, and prevents them from being beggarly dependents upon the people. Conscientious people lay their offerings before God, and then God's officers receive their portion as from their Master in heaven. "And it shall be Aaron's and his sons';" and they shall eat it in the holy place.

IV. THE WEEKLY OFFERING SHOULD BE THE OUTCOME OF AN EVERLASTING ENGAGEMENT WITH GOD. "Every sabbath (the priest) shall set it in order before the Lord continually, being taken from the children of Israel by an everlasting covenant." That is, liberality is to be no spasmodic outburst, but a steady outcome of an engagement that is perpetual. God has laid his people under such obligation by his rich provision in the gospel, that we feel we can never adequately discharge it. Hence week by week our offerings are laid upon his altar, and we recognize the arrangement as a lasting one.

Amid all the changes of times and of Churches, here have we sound principles of Church finance. It is to the religious spirit of the people we must ultimately commit the interests of God's cause. When they bring regularly, prayerfully, perpetually, and at the same time realize that the Church officers are God's servants and depend upon God's altar, then is there no fear of any failure. God will stand between his servants and his people, and secure the interests of both.—R. M. E.

Vers. 1—4.—*The lighting of the sanctuary.* The face of Moses is glorious in the light of the gospel.

I. THE CANDLESTICK WAS AN EMBLEM OF THE CHURCH OF GOD. (See Rev. i. 20.) 1. *The candlestick in the holy place was one.* (1) So is the Church of God a unity. Christ has not two mystical bodies (Col. i. 18). He has not two brides (Eph. v. 23). It comprehends the whole body of the faithful. (2) It is unscriptural as well as invidious for any denomination to style itself "The Church." Denominations are not even "Churches," though often so misnamed; they are, at best, but divisions of the grand army of the saints. 2. *It carried seven lamps.* (1) These are called "candlesticks" (Rev. i. 20). The reason is that visible Christian corporations, which are called "Churches" in the plural (see Acts ix. 31; xv. 41; xvi. 5), are *types* of the more perfect unity. (2) "Seven" is a definite, put for an indefinite, number. It is the numeral for *perfection*, and likewise stands for *many* (see 1 Sam. ii. 5). So the seven Churches of Asia, to which the candlestick is compared, are to be taken as representing the multitude of the Churches of Christendom. These are, indeed, countless, if, as Chrysostom says, "where two or three are gathered together in the name of Jesus there is a Church." 3. *The candlestick was of pure gold.* This was to express the preciousness of the saints. (1) They are precious to God. He has redeemed them with the blood of Christ. He has prepared for them a heaven of inconceivable magnificence. (2) They are precious to the world. They are its light. They are its salt. The light in them, like salt, is purifying and preserving, as well as illuminating (Matt. v. 13—16.)

II. THE LIGHT IN THE CHURCHES IS THE WORD OF GOD. This may be taken in

kindred senses. 1. *God's Word written.* (1) This is no uncertain light, as that of mere reason is. (2) It is no false light, as that of tradition often is. For, however pure it may have been at its source, it soon becomes corrupted in transmission. 2. *The personal Word of God.* (1) The presence of a personal Teacher in the living Spirit of Christ is a priceless blessing. (2) Such an Interpreter is infinitely better than popes or Councils. (3) Christians are still the disciples of the personal Jesus. They should cultivate in prayerfulness the simplicity and docility becoming such (see John vii. 17).

III. THE OIL THAT SUSTAINS THE LIGHT IS THE HOLY SPIRIT'S GRACE. No wonder it must be "pure oil olive beaten for the light." 1. *Jesus had the Spirit without measure.* (1) The fulness of the Godhead bodily was in him. So was he anointed with the oil of gladness immeasurably above his fellows. (2) Thus was he constituted the Christ, or Anointed One. 2. *Of his fulness we receive grace.* (1) Christians, therefore, with propriety have their name from Christ. Those who first gave that name in derision little knew its propriety (see 2 Cor. i. 21; 1 John ii. 20, 27). (2) This anointing is illuminating. So we learn in these references from John. It enlightens the Christian himself. It enables him to illumine others.

IV. THE OIL WAS FURNISHED BY THE WORSHIPPERS. 1. *There is a sense in which believers bring the Holy Ghost.* (1) They do this by their faith. When the faith of the people is constant, the lamps of the Churches "burn continually." What an honour to the faithful! (2) Through unfaithfulness the candlestick (or lamp) may be removed (see Rev. ii. 5; also Matt. xxi. 43). How great is the responsibility of professors! 2. *The Holy Ghost is nevertheless the Gift of God.* (1) This is true of his type. Who but God could put oil into the olive? (2) So of the Antitype. Accordingly, in Zech. iv. 2, 3, the oil is represented as feeding the candlestick immediately from the olive. The figure is explained thus, "Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of hosts" (Zech. iv. 6).

V. AARON AMONG THE LIGHTS REPRESENTED CHRIST AMONG HIS CHURCHES. 1. *This we have from the nature of the case.* The high priest was, generally, a type of Christ. So in this particular. 2. *We have it also by special revelation* (see Rev. i. 13).

VI. THE CANDLESTICK WAS WITHOUT THE VAIL. 1. *The Churches shine in this world.* (1) The sanctuary was the type of the kingdom of the heavens upon the earth. Here the candlestick was placed. (2) Every Church member should realize that he has his light from God that he may diffuse it (Matt. v. 14—16). 2. *The Shechinah was within the vail.* (1) There is no need of a candle in that bright Presence (see Isa. lx. 19, 20; Rev. xxi. 10, 23; xxii. 5). (2) The seven Churches are there lost in the one Church, which flames with the glory of God. If there are before the throne "seven lamps of fire," they are explained to be the "seven Spirits of God," or Holy Spirit, whose light is "sevenfold" or perfect (Rev. iv. 5; Isa. xxx. 26).—J. A. M.

Vers. 5—9.—*The bread of the presence.* As there was light on the candlestick in God's house, so was there bread on his table. It was called the "shewbread," literally, "bread of faces," or of the presence, viz. of Jehovah. Let us consider—

I. ITS DESCRIPTION. 1. *It was composed of fine flour.* (1) Christ is compared to a corn of wheat, viz. before it is ground, and while the life is whole in it (see Ps. lxxii. 16, where the "handful of corn" may be more literally construed a *corn of wheat*; and comp. John xii. 24, where Jesus evidently cites this passage and applies it to himself). (2) So is he compared to bread. This is corn whose life is sacrificed in the treatment to which it is subjected. Jesus calls himself the Bread who gives his life unto the world (John vi. 33). (3) The very manner in which corn loses its life to become nourishment, it being bruised and burnt, describes the sufferings of Christ in body and spirit from the hands of man and of God. (4) Bread is the staple in food. As without it there is no feast, so without Christ there is no true joy. As with it there is no hunger, so have we in him a satisfying portion. 2. *It was measured in tenths.* (1) Ten is the number for *riches*; and Christ, as the Rich One, is called a Tenth (see Isa. vi. 13). All the holy bread was measured in tenth-deals, to point to the "measure of the fulness of Christ" (Eph. iv. 7, 13). The riches of eternity are ours in him (see Homily on the Feast of Expiation). (2) But why *two* tenth-deals to each cake? Perhaps light may be let in upon this by noting that, on the sixth day, two omers, or tenths, of manna were gathered to prepare for the sabbath (Exod. xvi. 22). It

was on the sabbath that the bread of the presence was replaced. (3) This correspondence further identifies the typical import of the presence-bread with that of the manna. Note in addition that, as the manna came from God out of heaven, this bread is distinguished as that which comes from the Divine presence; and the true Bread of Life came from heaven (John vi. 33, 38, 40, 50, 51, 58). 3. *The number of the loaves was twelve.* (1) Here was a loaf for every son of Israel. "There is bread enough in our Father's house." (2) This number was continued after the revolt of the ten tribes (2 Chron. xiii. 11). This fact suggests that the number is also typical in relation to the spiritual Israel; a view confirmed by the application of the number twelve to the New Testament Church. Thus upon the head of the sun-clothed woman is a coronet of twelve stars, obviously in allusion to the twelve apostles of the Lamb, who are described as twelve angels at the twelve gates of the mystical city, and whose names are inscribed upon its twelve foundations (Rev. xii. 1; xxi. 12, 14, 21). (3) Twelve also is the number of the Lamb himself. He is the true Tree of Life, having twelve manner of fruits, corresponding to the twelve months in the year (Rev. xxii. 2). So the one Bread of the Presence is distributed into twelve loaves. And "we being many are one bread" in him (see 1 Cor. x. 17). (4) This association of the months with the loaves opens a very interesting field of investigation. Is there not a great year of the world to be measured by soli-lunar time (see Gen. i. 14)? King, in his 'Morsels of Criticism,' has a dissertation concerning the sabbath and a sabbatical era, in which he unfolds from the sabbatical intercalation of the Levitical system a more perfect adjustment of lunar to solar time than the Gregorian. Intercalations on the principle of the Jewish sabbatic period will in 400 years adjust the solar and lunar time within one hour and forty minutes. In fifteen such periods, or 6000 years, the adjustment will leave only one hour to be accounted for. But every 144,000 years, which is the square of 12 in thousands, and a number very remarkable in the measures of the New Jerusalem, things are brought right to a second (see Rev. vii. ; xiv. 3, 4; xxi. 17).

II. WHAT WAS DONE WITH IT. 1. *It was placed upon the table before the Lord.* (1) It was "before the Lord," for the Shechinah was separated from it only by the veil. The glory sometimes streamed out through the veil, as it did through the flesh of Christ on the mount of transfiguration. (2) It was then set in two rows of six over against each other. The purpose seems to have been to show how the tribes of the spiritual Israel will feast together in the fellowship of heaven. (3) It was in a sense there "continually," for it was replaced with new every sabbath. The Jews say, "The hands of those priests that put on were mixed with those that took off, that the table might be never empty." 2. *A memorial of it was burnt.* (1) It was "an offering made by fire unto the Lord." But how? Was it not eaten by the priests? When the cakes were removed the frankincense was burnt. This was the memorial of the whole; in this the whole was accepted as a burnt offering (comp. ch. ii. 2). This will explain the expression in the words of the angel to Cornelius, "Thy prayers and thine alms are come up for a memorial before God" (Acts x. 4). (2) But was this memorial burnt upon the table? We have no reason to think so. It was probably burnt upon the golden altar, which was the altar of incense. Note: the communion table ought never to be spoken of as an altar. It was from the table, not from the altar, that the priests ate the bread of the presence. (3) The spiritual priesthood alone have a right to partake of the true Bread of the Presence, and feast in fellowship with God.—J. A. M.

Vers. 1-4.—*Ourselves as lights.* There can be no doubt that the seven-branched candlestick in the holy place was typical of the Hebrew Church as the source of heavenly light. We therefore reach the subject of—

I. LIGHT DIVINELY KINDLED. All light must be of God, who himself is light (1 John i. 5). He has sought to illumine the human world in more ways than one. 1. He has given us the light of our spiritual nature—our reason, our conscience; "the spirit of man is the candle (lamp) of the Lord" (Prov. xx. 27). 2. This should have sufficed to us, but it did not; and God gave the revelation of himself in his Law. Amid the surrounding darkness there was light in Israel. The brightly burning lamp in the holy place represented the holy nation, the instructed people, with whom were the oracles of God, into whose minds the truth of heaven was shining. 3. Yet this did

not suffice, and God gave the Light of the world, his only begotten Son. "That was the true light which, coming into the world, enlighteneth every one." 4. And he came that he might leave in the world the light of the Christian Church; those to whom and of whom he could say, "Ye are the light of the world." "As he was, so are we in this world," sources of heavenly illumination, of inward purity, of Divine wisdom.

**II. Its TRUE CHARACTERISTICS.** These are: 1. Purity: they were to bring "pure oil olive beaten." The light which is to shine in our words and from our character is to be such that there shall be the least possible admixture of error and corruption. 2. Fulness: we read of "the lamps" (plural), and we know that there were seven of these (Exod. xxv. 31, 32)—a complete, perfect number. The truth we are to make manifest is not only to be pure, but full. We must declare the "whole counsel of God," the severest as well as the gracious, the less pleasant as well as the more acceptable, the deeper as well as the more superficial, the ethical as well as the doctrinal, aspects of the truth of God. 3. Constancy: they were "to cause the lamps to burn continually" (ver. 2), "from the evening unto the morning before the Lord continually" (ver. 3). Whether all day and all night long, or only (as seems more probable) through the night, the lamps were to burn all the appointed time without ceasing to shine; there was to be no fitfulness or unsteadiness about the light which shone "before the Lord." So our words and our deeds are to be *continually* reflecting the light of heavenly truth. In our work and in our play, in things sacred and in things secular, at home and from home, consciously and unconsciously, we are to be "bearing witness unto the truth," we are to be "shining as lights in the world."

**III. Its MAINTENANCE.** "Aaron shall order it." "He shall order the lamps." The Jewish priest was to take every care that the lamps burnt brightly and continually. 1. The Christian minister has to see that he does his part in "ordering the lamps." He must preach such truth and give such counsel as shall feed the fires of the soul most effectively. 2. Each Christian man must do his part also. Every one of us must (1) watch to see when the light is low; (2) replenish the spirit with sacred truth, that truth which nourishes and sustains the soul in the life of God; (3) seek from heaven those Divine influences which shall be as oil to the flame and make it

" . . . to his glory burn  
With inextinguishable blaze."

C.

**Vers. 5-9.—*The lesson of the loaves.*** In this act of worship the Jews made weekly acknowledgment of the goodness of God to them and of their dependence on him; they presented to him a suitable offering of those things he had given them; and they silently pleaded for God's continued remembrance of them and their necessities. The lesson of these loaves, of this "bread of presence," is therefore—

**I. THAT GOD'S GIFTS TO US ARE SUCH AS TO DEMAND OUR CONTINUAL ACKNOWLEDGMENT.** The Hebrew priest was to place before the Lord bread, the source of strength (Ps. civ. 15); wine, the source of gladness (Ps. civ. 15); and frankincense (ver. 7), the source of sweetness. He was to renew these presentations every sabbath day "continually" (ver. 8), and the table was never to be without them. This was a constant acknowledgment by the nation, through the act of the priesthood, of its dependence on God for all the good gifts received at his hand. We also, in our way, are to make *continual* acknowledgment every sabbath day in the sanctuary, every day at the family altar, and in the chamber of devotion, of our absolute dependence on God, for (1) our *strength*,—all things that minister to our health and vigour of body, mind, spirit, being due to his providing love; for (2) our *gladness*,—all those comforts and enjoyments, all those happy memories and inspiring hopes which make the music of our life, which infuse joyousness and elasticity into our nature, coming from his bountiful hand; and for (3) the *sweetness* of our life,—all the tender affections, the delicate delights which belong to pure and holy love, being the gift of his kindness also.

**II. THAT WITH OUR SENSE OF WHAT WE OWE TO GOD IT IS SUITABLE THAT WE PRESENT SOME OFFERING TO HIM.** Of that which made Israel strong, the priest presented bread; of that which made it glad, wine; of that which was sweet, frankincense. 1. Our strength is in mental power, knowledge, gift of speech, bodily vigour, wealth; of these

we should give a goodly share to the cause and kingdom of Jesus Christ. 2. Of our joy and gladness we should give to God our offering in gratitude, in thankful thoughts and in the voice of praise. 3. Of the affection which constitutes the sweetness of our life we are to give a large measure of love to him whom we have not seen, but whom we know as our Divine Redeemer and unchanging Friend.

III. THAT, SO DOING, WE MAY EXPECT RESPONSIVE BLESSINGS FROM HIM. This was to be done "for a memorial" (ver. 7), i.e. a "bringing to remembrance of the worshipper for his good." Jehovah was "continually" reminded of the devoutness of his people by the "bread of presence." He was thus continually appealed to, by that silent prayer, to "remember them for good." And as long as that act of worship in the holy place truly represented the spirit of the people, as long as it was *their* act, through the priests, of acknowledgment and consecration; so long was the Divine Sovereign well pleased with his subjects, so long was he ready to enrich and bless them. As long as we, instead of ascribing to ourselves the strength, joy, and sweetness of our lives, are honouring our God and Saviour for his goodness and grace therein, as long as we are cheerfully and generously giving to him and to his cause of that which he has given us; so long may we reckon on his gracious smile and look for his abundant blessing.—C.

Vers. 1-4.—*The lights in the sanctuary.* Pure oil furnished by the people. The high priest responsible for the maintenance of the lamps. Pure oil, pure lamps, pure candlestick, before the Lord continually. The main lessons are these—

I. PROGRESSIVE, CONTINUAL SANCTIFICATION of God's people provided for by his grace. 1. By the supply of the Spirit, the pure oil. 2. In and through the lamps; that is, the individual and positive manifestation of the spiritual life. 3. In connection with the golden candlestick, and in dependence on the ministry of the high priest; that is, by means of the Church and its ordinances, in so far as the manifestation and public maintenance of the light of life are concerned. Yet, as the people themselves provided the pure oil, we are reminded that personal sanctification is not dependent solely on public ordinances; but the Spirit worketh as he will (John iii. 8).

II. DIVINE FAITHFULNESS AND LONG-SUFFERING in the midst of the true Church. While the night is over them, the light still burns. While outside the temple there is gloom, within the sanctuary there is hope and promise.

III. TYPICALLY, THE PRESSED OIL AND BEATEN GOLD of the candlestick point to the connection of the work of the Spirit with the sacrificial work of Christ. The light of sanctification proceeds from the death of Christ, and is maintained by the priesthood of Christ.—R.

Vers. 5-9.—*The shewbread, or bread of the Presence.* Corresponding with the number of the tribes, and representing them; a national offering; a meat offering, with frankincense, drink offering, and salt. Taken from the people, eaten by the priests, every sabbath, for a memorial, by an everlasting covenant; "furnishing a striking figure of Israel's condition in the view of Jehovah, whatever might be their outward aspect. The twelve tribes are ever before him. Their memorial can never perish. They are ranged in Divine order in the sanctuary, covered with the fragrant incense of Christ, and reflected from the pure table whereon they rest beneath the bright beams of that golden lamp which shines, with undimmed lustre, through the darkest hour of the nation's moral night."

I. The perfect UNITY and completeness of the Church as before God. 1. As compared with the broken, external, visible unity. 2. As maintained by the Spirit and merit of Christ. 3. As hereafter to be manifested when there shall be no more temple, but the glory of God and of the Lamb are the temple of the heavenly Jerusalem.

II. The SAFETY and blessedness of God's people. Their memorial is before him. 1. Proceeding from the sanctuary, i.e. all blessedness the outcome of spiritual blessedness. 2. Committed to the Lord Jesus Christ as the Head of the true Israel, the Lord of the temple, in whom "all the promises are Yea and Amen." 3. Appealing to faith. The loaves were there to represent the continued life of the people; faith alone saw the reality.—R.

Vers. 2-4.—*The candlestick.* To many the regulations of Leviticus seem a crypto-

graph to which they have no key. To others, an inscription of old date with no reference to present concerns. Yet, dull-eyed must we be if we can discern no lessons for ourselves in the construction of the tabernacle and its furniture. The Hebrew can be translated into modern English, the Law stated in terms of the gospel. The tabernacle was the meeting-place of God with his people. It was his house, where his servants ministered and his guests were entertained. Light was needful therein,—the great requisite of life, without which men grow pale and plants sickly, work ceases, and festivity is impossible. Let us consider the candlestick with its light.

I. AS SETTING FORTH THE CHARACTER AND ATTRIBUTES OF GOD.

1. *The characteristics of light.* (1) Its beauty. Naught excels it; it is splendour itself, and invests other objects with radiance. "God is light." What a combination of hues constitutes the pure white ray! (2) An emblem of knowledge. "Thy Word is a light unto my path." "To the Law and to the testimony: if they . . . no light in them." Light is the revealer—indicates our position and prospects. The wisdom of God is infinite; an inscrutable blaze that baffles the strongest vision. He devises plans for every emergency. Whilst men argue concerning the possibility of some works, he calmly does them; yea, whilst they prove (1) that no God exists, he is occupied in balancing the worlds, directing the course of the ages, hastening the day when all shall perforse know him. (3) Typical of joy. "Light is sown for the righteous, and gladness for the upright in heart." Illuminatus are a worldwide method of rejoicing. The notions some hold concerning God as a hard Taskmaster, a Judge of severe countenance, a Father who never smiles, are not Biblical representations. We read of "the glorious gospel of the blessed (happy) God." Joy is an emotion that loves to communicate itself to others, and from the throne of God issues a stream of untainted happiness to enrich the lives of his children.
2. The burning lamps showed the *constant wakefulness of God.* The people retired to their couches for repose, darkness brooded over the camp, but the holy place was unaffected by the shadows of the night. God never slumbers nor sleeps. It may not have occurred to the Israelites that God heard prayer from o'er the compass of the globe; but, in order to be the God of the whole earth and to listen to the petitions of all its inhabitants, it follows of necessity that God has no couch in his sanctuary, for he resteth not. Whilst the day is closing in the one hemisphere it is beginning to dawn in the other. "In him is no darkness at all."
3. The candlestick indicated *perpetual existence.* "A statue for ever in your generations." Aaron might pass away, but the candlestick continued to give light in the tabernacle. Men die, God survives. As we behold the same sun and moon that gladdened the eyes of our forefathers, so it is the same God that hears our prayers and blessed us with the light of his countenance.

II. AS SETTING FORTH THE RELATIONSHIP AND FUNCTIONS OF THE PEOPLE.

1. *Their privileged condition as favoured with a special revelation of the being and character of God.* They were the only nation to possess such a candlestick made "after the pattern showed in the mount." All the heathen constructed deities and images of Deity according to their own judgment, taste, and caprice. The night during which the lamp burned was a fit emblem of the moral state of the world lying outside Israel. The Israelites were blessed with the light of the Law; "to them were committed the oracles of God." In the symbols of the Law was taught the way of salvation, to be completed by a coming Mediator. So in Jesus Christ we have "the light of the knowledge of the glory of God." At the Feast of Tabernacles, when according to custom large golden lamps were lit at dark in the temple court, our Lord termed himself "the Light of the world." We have the Spirit of God to illumine our consciences, to show unto us the things of Christ. We read in the Revelation of the seven burning lamps before the throne, which are the sevenfold Spirit of God. In Zechariah's vision of the candlestick he saw the bowls supplied with oil from two olive trees, representing the continued grace furnished by the Spirit of God, keeping alight the knowledge of God in days of the Church's decline. And we have the Word of God, "a light shining in a dark place." Let not this light condemn us as did the sacred candlestick removed to Belshazzar's palace, where its rays revealed the fingers of a man's hand writing the monarch's doom. "The word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day."
2. *Their duty to minister to the glory of God.* The people were permitted, yea, expected, to bring the oil for the lamps, as they had previously offered the gold for the

candlestick itself. They were to keep the light of God burning in the world. It is incumbent on Christians to support the ministry and the operations of the Church, that there may be a continual testimony to the existence and majesty of the Eternal. *God requires us to render the best service at our command.* It must be pure. The candlestick was of gold, as were the tongs and snuff-dishes, and the oil was of finest quality, free from dust, not crushed, but beaten. If preparing a meal for one we lightly esteem, little trouble is taken, but where we delight to honour our guest, what anxiety is displayed in all that concerns the banquet! *Our devotion must be regular.* The lamps were lit each evening, trimmed and dressed every morning. That the full light did not shine during the day is evident from 1 Sam. iii. 3. Josephus, however, says that three of the lamps burnt all day long. The lamp is said to "ascend," it rises to heaven as a tribute of adoration to God. We may think of him as viewing his world, and expecting light to arise from different quarters where his children dwell. But how often must disappointment accrue! No morning perusal of his Word, no evening worship. A mother on her birthday delights to turn over the letters from her children, that greet her upon her plate, but if one familiar handwriting be missed, what a shadow darkens her joy! The chill that creeps over her heart seems to nullify the gladness which the tokens of remembrance cause. Let not God have to sigh over our neglect. *All is accepted through the priesthood.* No Levite or layman must enter the holy precincts, the priests represent and are supported by the people. Jesus Christ is our means of access to the Father; through him our service is acceptable. To venture to draw nigh in our name is presumption; it sets at naught the solemn regulations of the Most High, and it will receive the rebuke it merits. The Son of man must walk in the midst of our golden candlesticks, or else we know not that they are in accordance with the Divine mind; and only thus can we hear the exhortations that shall prevent the candlestick from being removed out of its place because of failure to discharge its proper functions.

—S. R. A.

Vers. 5—9.—*The shewbread.* The furniture and ministry of the tabernacle are most clearly understood in import, if it be remembered that they have a double reference. Like the clouds of the sky, one aspect is towards heaven, the other towards earth. In the ordinance of the shewbread, we may see imaged truths relating to God, and truths with more immediate reference to the position and duties of his people.

I. **God as THE PRESERVER OF LIFE.** Food was essential to the conception of the tabernacle as the house of God. Unless he minister to the needs of his servants, they perish for lack of sustenance. "My Father giveth you the true Bread from heaven." The shewbread is literally the "bread of my face," or presence. Jesus Christ, the Bread of Life, appears continually before the presence of God. *God is never unprovided with entertainment for his guests.* He is *able also to supply the wants of all his people.* Twelve loaves indicate that every tribe is remembered. As we think of the shewbread, let it point us to him who pointed to the Bread upon the table of the last Supper and said, "This is my body." He was truly of the finest of the wheat, no corruption marred his perfection. He was prepared to be the Bread of the world by many sufferings, just as the flour of the shewbread underwent numerous poundings and bruising.

II. **THE PEOPLE CONTRIBUTING THE BREAD OF GOD.** A parent bestows an allowance upon his children, and is none the less pleased when they devote a portion of it to purchasing some offering of regard to present to him. So from God do we derive all we possess; it is really his, and yet he graciously accepts as our gift to him what we consecrate to his service. This shewbread represented the result of toil in tilling, sowing, and reaping. The Israelites were expected to *offer of the best of their property.* Only fine wheaten flour is accepted to be placed upon the table. Love should secure this attention if naught else suffices. *All the people are bound to be represented before God.* The twelve cakes testified that God was reverenced and served by all the tribes. *The duty one of perpetual and unceasing obligation.* It recurred every week, and devolved on each succeeding generation. The continual observance of God's statutes is the token of the covenant. *The shewbread perfumed with incense.* The loaves were accepted indirectly by God, being consumed by his consecrated servants, but the incense was burned as God's special memorial. Prayer hallows every offering, without it our deeds and gifts lack the religious spirit that is the real honouring of God. And prayer

should ever be in the Name of Christ, whose merits impart fragrance to our unworthy presentations. *We must not rest satisfied with our former religious deeds.* The offering of last week needs to be repeated, else it will grow stale and be offensive to God. With every day, in fact, should come a rededication. As our physical frame is in constant flux, so is it with our thoughts and emotions; they are really new, and must in their turn be laid before God.—S. R. A.

### EXPOSITION.

The reason why the narrative of the blasphemer's death (vers. 10—23) is introduced in its present connection, is simply that it took place at the point of time which followed the promulgation of the last law. It serves, however, to vindicate by a memorable example the principle which is at the foundation of every Mosaic law. "I am the Lord" is the often-repeated sanction, whether of a moral law or of a ceremonial regulation. But this bastard Israelite, one of the mixed multitude that had followed in the flight from Egypt (Exod. xii. 38), blasphemed the Name of the Lord. If such blasphemy were to go unpunished, the obligation of law was dissolved. For, as Lange has said, "A community which suffers the reviling of the principle of their community without reaction, is morally fallen to pieces." He was brought, therefore, to Moses, and so solemn was the occasion, that Moses reserved the case, for which no provision had yet been made, for the special decision of God. The specific judgment on the man is that he shall die by stoning at the hands of the congregation, after the witnesses of his sin had laid their hands upon his head; and a general law is founded on the special case.

Ver. 10.—The son of an Israelitish woman. This is the only place where the adjective *Israelitish* is found; and the word "Israelite" only occurs in 2 Sam. xvii. 25. Whose father was an Egyptian. The man could not, therefore, be a member of the congregation, as, according to the subsequently promulgated law (Deut. xxiii. 8), the descendant of an Egyptian could not be admitted till the third generation. He seems to have committed two offences which led up to his great crime. First, he went out among the children of Israel, that is, he did not confine himself to his own part of the encampment, where the mixed multitude lived, but he intruded into the part set aside for pure Israelites; and next, having thus put himself already in the wrong, this son of the Israelitish woman and a man of Israel

strove together in the camp. According to Jewish tradition, the cause of quarrel was a claim set up by the Egypto-Israelite to encamp in the Danite quarters, on the ground that his mother was a Danite—a claim which he insisted on enforcing, although the judges gave a decision against him.

Ver. 11.—In the course of the struggle the Israelitish woman's son blasphemed the name of the Lord, and cursed. The word *nakar* is here rightly translated *blasphemeth* (cf. vers. 14, 16, 23), but the words of *the Lord* should be omitted, as they are not found in the original, and are not required. The LXX. have rendered *nakar* by a word meaning *pronounced*, and on this misunderstanding, adopted by the Jews, has been founded the Jewish precept forbidding the utterance of the Divine Name. Owing to that prohibition, the true pronunciation of the word written and called "Jehovah" has been lost. Wherever the Name occurred in Scripture, that of *Adonai*, meaning *Lord*, was substituted for it in public reading, the consonants only of the original name, Y H V H, being preserved in the written text, and the vowels of *Adonai*, namely *a o a*, being written underneath them in lieu of the original vowels. From the consonants Y H V H and the vowels *a o a* would be formed *Yahovah* or *Jahovah*, but the laws of the Hebrew language required the first *a* to be changed into *e*, and hence the name *Jehovah*. It is almost certain that the original vowels were *a* and *e*, which would form the name *Yahveh*, the Samaritans having always so pronounced it, according to the testimony of Theodoret. It is said that the high priest continued to utter the very name *Yahveh* on the Day of Atonement long after it had ceased to be used in the reading of the Scriptures, and that when he did so, those who heard it prostrated themselves, saying, "Blessed be the Name!" After a time, however, he ceased to pronounce it aloud on that day also, lest it should be learnt and used for magical purposes. In consequence, perhaps, of the substitution of *Adonai* for *Yahveh*, the Septuagint version always reads for *Yahveh*, *Kipos*: and the English version *the Lord*. In French and other versions the name is

represented by *the Eternal*, and it has been proposed to substitute the latter rendering for *the Lord* in our own version. But it is more than doubtful whether we should then come nearer to the true sense of the original *Yahveh*, although at first sight it appears that this would be the case. For the word *Yahveh* is part of the causative form of the verb *hava*, or *hayah*, to be; but this verb is not used to express unchangeable or absolute existence, but rather an occurrence: its causative form, therefore, would signify that which brings about events; and the substantive derived from that causative form would signify, not one that eternally exists, but one that providentially governs. For an induction of instances for the further proof of the above meaning of the word *Yahveh*, we refer the reader to Sir William Martin's essay 'On the Divine Name' ('Semitic Languages,' pt. ii.), from which we transcribe the concluding paragraph. "This view of the Divine Name, to which we are led by the evidence of the Hebrew language itself, is in full conformity with the general religious teaching of the Old Testament, which is practical and moral; setting forth in form readily intelligible, the character of God in his relations to man. It does not concern itself with those problems which philosophy has ever been seeking to solve. It addressed itself to human needs and human duties, and not to abstract inquiries. Not that the highest abstract truths were unknown or untaught. Lawgiver and prophet and psalmist set before the people the greatness and the eternity of God in language most clear and impressive. Yet the Name whereby he was put before them as the object of their daily worship, was not one which would exalt him to the utmost above the frail and changeful and transitory lives of his worshippers, and thereby remove him far away from them into the height of a Being beyond man's search or comprehension; but rather a Name which should bring him nigh to them, as One ever mindful of them, ever carrying forward his great purpose for their good, working for their deliverance in every time of need; as One 'whose providence ordereth all things in heaven and on earth.' If this Name did convey to the mind of a Hebrew hearer the thought above expressed, it follows that the old rendering *Adonai*, *Kipos*, or *Lord*, is to be preferred to that which has of late been substituted for it." And they brought the blasphemer unto **Moses**. This was in accordance with the counsel of Jethro, accepted by Moses (Exod. xviii. 13—26): "Moreover thou shalt provide out of all the people able men, such as fear God, men of truth, hating covetous-

ness; and place such over them, to be rulers of thousands, and rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties, and rulers of tens: and let them judge the people at all seasons: and it shall be, that every great matter they shall bring unto thee, but every small matter they shall judge: . . . and they judged the people at all seasons: the hard causes they brought unto **Moses**, but every small matter they judged themselves."

Ver. 12.—*And they put him in ward.* The same course was followed in the case of the man found gathering sticks upon the sabbath day: "And they put him in ward, because it was not declared what should be done to him" (Numb. xv. 34). The same penalty was awarded in both cases.

Vers. 13, 14.—*Bring forth him that hath cursed without the camp;*—lest the camp should become polluted by his death—and let all that heard him lay their hands upon his head. The ceremony of laying on of hands in all cases set apart the person or thing on whom or on which they were laid for some special purpose. Its further signification was determined by the particular circumstances of the case. Here it probably returned back on the head of the blasphemer the guilt which otherwise would have adhered to the witnesses from the fact of their hearing his blasphemy, and appearing to acquiesce in it.

Vers. 15, 16.—In accordance with the judicial decision on the man is framed the general law against blasphemy and its penalty. It runs as follows: *Whosoever curseth his God shall bear his sin. And he that blasphemeth the name of the Lord, he shall surely be put to death, and all the congregation shall certainly stone him.* It has been questioned whether two offences or one are here contemplated, whether *cursing his God* is one offence, *bearing his sin* being its punishment, and *blaspheming the Name of the Lord* another and greater offence, for which the punishment is *stoning*; or whether the latter offence and punishment are a more specific statement of the offence and punishment which had only generally been described before. Those who take the first view point out that the present offender was an Egyptian, and urge that had he cursed *his God*, that is, the Egyptian god or gods, he would only have had to bear his sin; but that as he had blasphemed the Name of Israel's God, *Jehovah*, he was to be stoned. The second explanation, however, is the truer one. The Scriptures recognize but one God, and he is the Lord *Jehovah*. Whoever curses him shall bear his sin, that is, shall be guilty in such a way that his sin must be purged either by punishment or by sacrifice, and it is then further declared that this particular sin can

be purged only by the death of the offender at the hand of the congregation.

Ver. 17.—In close connection with the command to slay the blasphemer is repeated the prohibition of murder, and the injunction that the murderer shall surely be put to death. Thus a distinction is sharply drawn between the judicial sentence carried out by the congregation, and the un sanctioned smiting the life of a man by another, and a warning is given against any man fanatically taking the law into his own hands, even in the case of a blasphemer.

Vers. 18—21.—A summary of the law respecting minor injuries is added to that respecting murder. He that killeth a man, he shall be put to death, but he that killeth a beast shall make it good; and this *lex talionis* shall apply to all damage done to another, breach for breach, eye for eye, tooth for tooth (see Matt. v. 38).

Ver. 22.—As it had been a stranger who had on this occasion been the offender, the law, Ye shall have one manner of law, as well for the stranger, as for one of your own country, with the sanction, I am the Lord your God, is emphatically repeated (see ch. xix. 34).

Ver. 23.—The penalty is inflicted on the offender solemnly as an act of the Law, not of mob fury. So it was by a judicial or semi-judicial proceeding that St. Stephen was stoned: "They brought him to the council, and set up false witnesses, which said, This man ceaseth not to speak blasphemous words against this holy place, and the Law" (Acts vi. 12, 13). And in spite of the violence exhibited, there was still some form of law, according to Jewish practice, observed in his stoning (Acts vii. 58). In the case of our Lord, on the other hand, when they regarded him as guilty of blasphemy on his saying, "Before Abraham was, I am" (John viii. 58), and "I and my Father are one" (John x. 30), the Jews "took up stones to cast at him," not waiting for a judicial condemnation, but, as they supposed, taking the law into their own hands. Had his death been by Jewish hands, it would at the last have been by stoning under this law. But the power of life and death had been taken away from the Jews by the Romans, "that the saying of Jesus might be fulfilled, which he spake, signifying what death he should die" (John xix. 32).

## HOMILETICS.

Vers. 11—16.—The Name of the Lord is a revelation of his nature. Names given or taken by man may be imposed from accidental circumstances. A name given by God denotes an essential quality of the thing named. Hence if we can arrive at the true meaning of God's Name, as revealed by himself, we shall have a manifestation of himself as he chose to reveal his nature to man.

I. After the primary Name of Elohim, where we mark the plural form of the noun, the Name by which he revealed himself to the patriarchs was that of *El Shaddai*, God ALMIGHTY. His omnipotence was the part of his nature which he specially manifested to them (Exod. vi. 3).

II. To Moses he revealed himself under the name of EHYEH, ASHER EHYEH, or I AM THAT I AM. The word *Ehyeh* is not used for absolute existence in any place where it is found in the Scriptures, but rather for condition or relation. "The meaning to be given to the words, if we guide ourselves by the evidence furnished by the Hebrew books, may be paraphrased in this way, '*I show myself from time to time, even as I show myself.*' I stand from time to time in varying relation to men. This is my Name. Only from my dealings with men is my character to be apprehended by men'" (Sir W. Martin, 'Semitic Languages').

III. He also revealed himself to Moses as YAHVEH. Neither is this word used for absolute existence. It means the One who causes things to happen as they do.

IV. IN THESE THREE NAMES, THEN, WE FIND THE REVELATION THAT GOD THOUGHT PROPER THEREBY TO GIVE TO HIS ANCIENT PEOPLE. He is the Almighty Spiritual Being, who manifests himself as he wills to his creatures, and governs by his providence the universe and all the events of human life. This is the *proclamation* of his Name by God himself. "And Yahveh descended in the cloud, and stood with Moses there, and proclaimed the name of Yahveh. And Yahveh passed by before him, and proclaimed, Yahveh, Yahveh Elohim, merciful and gracious, longsuffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty; visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and upon the children's children, unto the third and to the

fourth generation" (Exod. xxxiv. 5—7). In the Old Testament, then, God does not, by his Name, reveal his absolute nature, but his relation to man as the Supreme Moral Governor of the world, whose characteristic in that government was omnipotence, uncontrolled by anything but his own will, but guided by mercy and justice.

V. IN THE NEW TESTAMENT, NOT ONLY GOD'S RELATION TO MAN, BUT ALSO HIS OWN NATURE, IS REVEALED BY THE NAME OF FATHER, SON, AND HOLY GHOST. These names exhibit to us, so far as human faculties can apprehend them, the very Godhead, not merely as governing man, but in its essential character. "The revealed Name of God, given to the apostles in the tradition of holy baptism, is a revelation of truth. The entire Christian revelation is in the way of a summary contained in it. It is itself a doctrine and the sum of all doctrine. It was originally given in order that the world might be taught it ('make disciples of all nations'), and it contains all that the world, in the way of religion, needs to be taught. The apostles, indeed, by Divine inspiration, developed it into its essential and necessary details, summed into the Apostles' Creed; but in itself, that is, in the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, all was shortly comprised. In like manner, it is a creed and the sum of all creeds; for while we read that it was often used as a creed in early times, the structure of the subsequent authoritative creeds of the Church has been so framed upon it, and their contents so confined to it, that what we chiefly learn in all the articles of our belief, whether contained in the Apostles', the Nicene, or the Athanasian formula, is first, to believe in God the Father, who hath made all the world; secondly, in God the Son, who hath redeemed all mankind; and thirdly, in God the Holy Ghost, who sanctifieth all the elect people of God. . . . All the great elements and outlines of inspired teaching, as they are gathered into the Apostles' Creed, and all the minute expressions and articulations of truth as given to the Church in writing by the apostles, are to be regarded with deep, true, and habitual reverence for the sake of the Name of God" (Moberly, 'The Law of the Love of God').

VI. THE NAME JESUS CHRIST INDICATES THE WORD AND THE RELATION TO OURSELVES OF HIM WHO BEING MAN WAS ALSO GOD. 1. Christ is the Anointed One. "God anointed Jesus . . . with the Holy Ghost and with power" (Acts x. 38). "The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, . . . full of grace and truth" (John i. 14); "for God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him" (John iii. 34); "for it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell" (Col. i. 19). 2. Jesus is the Saviour. "Thou shalt call his name Jesus: for he shall save his people from their sins" (Matt. i. 21). "Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved" (Acts iv. 12); "a Prince and a Saviour" (Acts v. 31); "a Saviour, Jesus" (Acts xiii. 23). "He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed. . . . The Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all. . . . For the transgression of my people was he stricken" (Isa. liii. 5—8). The Name Jesus Christ, therefore, indicates that he who bore it was the promised Messiah (Dan. ix. 25; John i. 41), filled to the full with the grace of the Holy Spirit, and the Saviour of those that put their trust in him.

#### HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

*The crime of blasphemy.* Ch. xxiv. 10—16; cf. 2 Chron. xxvi. 16—23; Dan. v. 1—4, 30. The sanctity of the Name of God is distinctly declared in the third commandment. There the Lord declared that he would not hold the blasphemer "guiltless." But it was not till the incident now before us that God showed his sense of the enormity of the crime. He here puts it into the category of capital crimes, and decrees the death of every blasphemer, whether he be a stranger or one born in the land.

Now, when we inquire, we find that he calls it "this glorious and fearful name, THE LORD THY GOD" (Deut. xxviii. 58). So glorious is it that inanimate things, when his Name is put upon them, cannot be desecrated with impunity. Thus his tabernacle could not be treated even by a king according to his capricious pleasure, but Uzziah, for presuming to burn incense within it, is doomed to leprosy and exile all his life (2 Chron. xxvi. 16—23). Belshazzar too paid the penalty of his life for desecrating the vessels belonging to the tabernacle (Dan. v. 1—4, 30).

The case before us was one of pure blasphemy. This reckless youth, the son of an Egyptian father, had blasphemed "the Name," and for this he was stoned to death after those who heard the blasphemy had laid their hands on his head.

I. LET US START WITH THE FUNDAMENTAL TRUTH THAT THE NAME OF GOD IS THE REVELATION OF HIS CHARACTER IN WORD. Hence to take up the Name of God lightly is to treat his character lightly. It is, in fact, to despise the Person, and is nothing less than treason against the Supreme King. The individual who blasphemes "the Name" would take up arms against the Person, and so must be treated as a rebel. When, therefore, we bear in mind that God makes known his Name that men may trust in him (cf. Ps. ix. 10), the blaspheming of his holy Name is really the rejection of his appeal for trust, the rejection of his merciful manifestation, and deserves the penalty attached to it.

II. MAN'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS GOD'S NAME DETERMINES HIS CHARACTER. In other words, the Name of God is the touchstone of human character. The person who curseth the holy Name, as this reckless youth did, is thereby judged. He has voluntarily set himself against the Almighty, he has become a rebel not in heart only but openly, and if the Most High is to exercise his authority, the blasphemer should die. It is, moreover, a mistake to imagine, because sentence is not now executed so speedily against blasphemers, that their awful sin has become less heinous in the lapse of ages. The shortsighted individual who defies the Almighty will find eventually how hard are the bosses of his buckler.

III. THE PENALTY ATTACHED TO BLASPHEMY IS TO BE ACQUIESCED IN BY THE PEOPLE OF THE LORD. The whole congregation in this case is called upon to repudiate the awful crime. Those who heard it are required to lay their hands on the blasphemer's head, to indicate that the guilt must be his own. They will not share it, and then the whole congregation are to be the executioners of the Divine decree. Now we are bound to entertain a similar and holy abhorrence of such a crime. We are most assuredly sinking in character if, through association with careless men, we come to regard blasphemy when indulged in as a light thing. The truth is, if we are making spiritual progress, we shall be advancing in the fear of his Name. Greater awe, not greater familiarity, will characterize us, until at length we shall see it to be just and right, if treason towards mere potentates on earth is regarded as a capital offence, much more ought treason against "the blessed and only Potentate" to be visited with death.

IV. LET US IN CONSEQUENCE ALL BOW AT THE NAME OF JESUS. To him hath the Father given a Name that is above every name, that at it every knee should bow (Phil. ii. 9, 10). Submitting reverently to him, we shall find in his Name that marvellous significance which was heralded before his birth (Matt. i. 21). As our Saviour from sin, he will show us how reasonable is the exhortation, "Let every one that nameth the Name of Christ depart from iniquity" (2 Tim. ii. 19). Baptized in his Name, as well as in the Name of the Father and of the Holy Ghost, we shall look to him for the fulfilment of the covenant promise therein implied.<sup>1</sup> Under the shadow of the Name and in the light of the face of God revealed in Jesus Christ, we shall be enabled to pass on reverently and peacefully towards our everlasting rest.—R. M. E.

*Public justice secured by the law of retaliation.* Ch. xxiv. 17—22; cf. Matt. v. 38—48; Rom. xii. 19—21. There is here presented to us, as a law upon which Israel was to act, the principle of retaliation. And yet we have seen in the moralities of ch. xix. 17, 18, an express denunciation of *revenge*. How are we to reconcile this retaliation commanded with the *revenge* which is forbidden? Evidently the retaliation is to be deliberate, in cool blood, without the fever-heat of vengeance.

Now, when we bear in mind the early age to which this law of retaliation was given, an age when the institution of public justice was rudimentary in character, then we can understand how very important a check it was on the lawlessness to which men are naturally tempted. Of course, when public justice has developed itself into a wide and vigilant system, the necessity for each man taking the law into his own hand ceases. Then it becomes a crime against law to usurp its functions; it only increases lawlessness to attempt for one's self what the organized state willingly undertakes for you.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Tait's 'Thoughts for the Thoughtful,' pp. 186—195.

But in rude ages it is eminently desirable that savage spirits should contemplate as a dead certainty getting as much as they give.<sup>1</sup> Let us notice one or two points.

I. THE LAW OF RETALIATION, ADMINISTERED IN A JUDICIAL SPIRIT, WAS IN THE INTERESTS OF JUSTICE AND ORDER. Its principle is a sound one. The criminal is to get exactly what he gave. It is only in this way that the nature of a crime can be driven home to a rude and tyrannical nature. If he has been cruel to a neighbour, let him taste the effect himself of the same amount of cruelty. A man who victimizes his neighbours will cease doing so if he finds that he is to be victimized in exactly the same fashion by public law. In fact, he comes to consider his own case as bound up most intimately with his neighbours', and, instead of indulging in cruelty, he by his better conduct ensures his personal peace.

And a distinct corollary of this law of retaliation is the penalty of murder (vers. 17, 21). If a man deliberately puts his brother out of life, it is an injury which admits of no repair, and so death becomes its just penalty.

II. THE LAW OF RETALIATION IS IN ONE RESPECT A PREPARATION FOR THE GOLDEN RULE. For the golden rule runs parallel to it. It is, so to speak, its glorious issue. "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the Law and the prophets" (Matt. vii. 12). Yes, this very law of retaliation suggests to every thoughtful mind whether it would not be better to try the opposite plan, and do to others, not what we should be *afraid* they would do to us, but what we would *like* them to do to us. In other words, let us wisely win the good services of others, if we are to receive what we give, by doing all to them and for them that we would welcome ourselves.

And indeed, the reason why the golden rule does not prevail as widely as it might, is because *immediate* justice is not now executed as in the case of a law of retaliation it is. The return of kindness is often impeded by ingratitude, and men may do good to others for a long lifetime without receiving much thanks. But such an arrangement gives a field for faith and courage, such as a government of instantaneous justice could not secure. In truth, we should become mere mercenaries if the golden rule involved instantaneous returns. Now, however, we must rely on the wide range of providence, and believe that in the end it will prove wisest and best to have treated our neighbour as we would like to be treated ourselves.

III. IN CULTIVATING THE SPIRIT OF LOVE TOWARDS EVEN OUR ENEMIES, WE ARE BUT FOLLOWING THE FOOTSTEPS OF OUR FATHER IN HEAVEN. For while re-enforcing the courage of his people in rude ages by commanding retaliation, he was himself at the same time making his sun to shine on the evil and on the good, and sending rain upon the just and on the unjust (Matt. v. 45). He was not dealing with men after their sins, nor rewarding them according to their iniquities (Ps. ciii. 10). Not only in Nature, with its dignified refusal to be a respecter of persons, but also in his sacrificial worship, was God dealing with his enemies so as to make them his friends. He was pursuing even then the policy of overcoming evil by good (Rom. xii. 21). Such laws as retaliation, resting on inexorable justice, did something to *check* sin; but only love and goodness can overcome it. Hence the spirit of the old dispensation, while hostile to sin, as the outcome of a holy God must be, had an undertone of love and mercy. God, in fact, was practising all the time his own golden rule. He was doing by men what he wanted men to do by him. In some cases this succeeded, for this is the substance of the Divine appeal in the gospel of Christ, as it was the undertone of the preliminary law; in some cases it failed through the waywardness of men. Still, the golden rule is the spirit of the Divine administration, and will be till the present dispensation is finished. Then must the great Governor deal with the impenitent in the way of strictest justice, since they will not yield to his dying love. The rhythm of the ages will be maintained; if the wrath of man is not turned to praise by the exercise of love, it must be restrained by the exercise of the cool and deliberate infliction of deserved wrath.—R. M. E.

Vers. 10—23.—*Shelomith's son.* Here a narrative is introduced into the midst of a code of laws; but this is done as a preamble to enactments of whose publication the case was the occasion. We notice—

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Canon Mozley's 'Ruling Ideas in Early Ages,' pp. 180—221.

I. THE CRIME OF THIS SON OF SHELOMITH. 1. *It was blaspheming the God of Israel.* (1) We are not distinctly informed as to the particular form of this blasphemy. We are, however, told that this man, whose name is not given, was "the son of an Israelitish woman," that his father was an Egyptian, and that in striving with a man of Israel he blasphemed the sacred Name. It may hence be concluded that he angrily reflected upon the Divine equity in favouring the seed of Jacob. Anger is certainly implied in the words, "blasphemed the Name, and cursed." (2) Here was the very spirit of Satan, whose rebellion against God was probably excited by the honour he had put upon man. "Is thine eye evil because I am good?" (3) Is not that hatred to God which is in the carnal mind of the very essence of this blasphemy? Though the manifestations be restrained, the venom is still there. Let us beware how we entertain hard thoughts of God. 2. *Strife was its occasion.* (1) How little do men dream, when they enter into strife, where they may be carried by their passions (see Prov. xvii. 14)! The moral, therefore, is that it should be carefully avoided. (2) But how is this to be done? We must "give none offence." We must be willing to *suffer* wrong. The spirit (or temper) of Christ is gained through the indwelling of his (Divine) Spirit. 3. *Race was the origin of the strife.* (1) It appears to have been a contention between a pure Israelite and a mongrel. The father of Shelomith's son was probably one of the mixed multitude that came up with the Hebrews from Egypt. (2) Traced back another step, we find the origin in the marriage of Shelomith. Mixed marriages have ever been prolific in mischief. Of these sprang the monsters, viz. not so much in stature as in iniquity, who provoked the Deluge. (3) Even Dibri, the father of Shelomith, was, 'remotely, responsible for the blasphemy of her son, by consenting to her marriage with an alien. How careful we should be never to commit a wrong, since no man can tell how prolific it may be in mischief! The day of judgment will declare it.

II. THE IMPEACHMENT OF THE BLASPHEMER. 1. *His witnesses arrested him.* (1) They were bound to do so. Had they allowed him to escape they would have been accomplices in his crime (see ch. xix. 17, margin). They might have brought down the wrath of God upon the nation. Witness how Achan troubled Israel (Josh. vii. 1), and how David also brought down a plague upon his people (2 Sam. xxiv. 15—17). (2) Happy is the nation whose sons are jealous for the honour of God (see Ps. lxix. 9). Happy is the nation whose sons are guardians of its morality. This is public spirit in perfection. 2. *They kept him in ward for the judgment of God.* (1) They brought his case before Moses (ver. 11). This was in accordance with Divine direction (see Exod. xviii. 22). They might have wreaked a summary vengeance, but they chose the more excellent way. "Judgment is of God" (Deut. i. 17); therefore judgment should be deliberate. (2) Moses accordingly appealed to God. Every cause must come ultimately before him. This should never be forgotten.

III. THE JUDGMENT OF THE LORD. 1. *This had respect to the particular offender.* (1) He was to be carried without the camp, as an outcast from society and a person excommunicated from the Church. (2) There he was to die for his sin. The witnesses put their hands on his head. This was to clear themselves of all complicity in his guilt. His blood then ostensibly was upon his own head. (3) Stoning him was to be the mode of his punishment. The witnesses cast the first stone, and the congregation, by their representatives, followed, until he perished. Thus, as Henry says, in allusion to Ps. lxiv. 8, the tongue of the blasphemer fell heavily (see Deut. xvii. 7; John viii. 7). 2. *It had also respect to the community.* (1) This judgment was now made a law in Israel, as well for the stranger as for him that is born in the land. (2) It was also enacted that murder must be visited with death (vers. 17, 20). This was the incorporation in the Levitical code of the Noachian precept recorded in Gen. ix. 6. (3) The principle of compensation and retaliation was asserted (vers. 19, 20). In things judicial this principle still holds, though in matters of private wrong the gospel direction is that evil be suffered rather than revenged (see Matt. v. 38, 39; vii. 1, 2).—J. A. M.

Vers. 10—16, 23.—*A suggestive episode.* We have an affecting illustration in these verses of the truth that "The Law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, . . . for unholy and profane" (1 Tim. i. 9). The announcement of the Law is broken by the account of this transgression, and the transgression itself gives

occasion for the enactment of other statutes (vers. 15—22). The story and the statutes suggest—

I. **WHAT LASTING EVIL MAY ACCRUE FROM AN UNHOLY ALLIANCE.** Had the Israelitish woman not married an Egyptian (ver. 10), it is morally certain that she would not have been called upon to part with her son under these tragic and terrible circumstances. She consulted her own fancy rather than the known will of Jehovah, and, long years afterwards, she bore her penalty in maternal grief. There is nothing fraught with more grave and enduring evils than an unwise, unholy alliance.

II. **HOW LIKELY ONE FOLLY IS TO END IN ANOTHER.** This son of the Israelitish woman strove with a man of Israel in the camp, and their strife led to blasphemy and cursing on the part of one of them. Strife led to profanity. Similarly, carelessness often ends in fraud, fraud in falsehood, indelicacy in impurity, occasional excess in habitual intemperance, anger in murder, etc.

III. **HOW SERIOUS A SIN MAY RESIDE IN A FEW WRONG WORDS.** (Ver. 16.) Probably the words in which Shelomith's son blasphemed were few in number. Words are but breath, impressions made on the air, we may say. Yet, simple though they be, they may (1) reveal a most foul and guilty state of soul, (2) work terrible mischief to other souls, (3) be heard with deep abhorrence by God and the good.

IV. **HOW WISE A COURSE IS THE PATIENT ADMINISTRATION OF LAW.** Had the crowd that gathered at the strife between these two men inflicted condign punishment on the transgressor, the event would have been regarded as an ordinary disturbance, and no moral effect would have been produced. Possibly the guilty man would have been pitied as a victim of the violence of a mob. But by the patient course pursued (vers. 11—15, 23) it was clearly seen by all that the man died because he had committed a grievous sin, and that whosoever followed him in his guilt must expect to suffer the same penalty he endured. Thus that which might have seemed nothing better than fatal exasperation was made to wear the true aspect of righteous vindication of law. It is always best to be patient in the infliction of punishment. Here as everywhere, but here especially, calmness is strength, passion is weakness. By restraining ourselves from hasty action we may restrain many others from the commission of sin.

V. **HOW SAD A SERVICE SOME MEN ARE COMPELLED TO RENDER THEIR RACE.** Some men serve their fellows involuntarily. They become beacons to warn all who approach from the danger they are running. Shemoloth's son, by this evil deed of his, caused the enactment of ver. 16; and this weighty law, together with the impressive circumstance out of which it grew, undoubtedly produced a very deep and permanent impression on Israel. It materially contributed to the very striking result that no nation has been more reverent in its tone and spirit than the Jews. It is a sad reflection that a man should serve his race by suffering death as the penalty of his sin. We may be compelled, by overruling Omniscience, so to serve others. How much rather would the heavenly Father accept our willing service, and make use of our devout endeavour to bless our kind!—C.

**Vers. 17—22.—*The holy Law of God.*** These enactments, occasioned by the sin of the son of Shemoloth, contain certain principles on which God founded his Law, and which he would have us introduce into our dealings and regulations now. These are—

I. **THE SACREDNESS OF HUMAN LIFE.** “He that killeth any man shall surely be put to death” (ver. 17). This is significantly repeated (ver. 21). We can hardly be said to have learnt this lesson yet, after eighteen centuries of Christian legislation. Here, however, is a statute which unmistakably and emphatically asserts it.

II. **EQUITY.** There is to be careful discrimination in awarding penalty (vers. 18—20). A man must suffer according to the injury he has done. Nothing is more destructive of the main purpose of law than undistinguishing, and therefore unrighteous, retribution, whether at the national tribunal, or in the school, or in the home; nothing more salutary than the calm, regulated equity which estimates degrees of guilt, and determines the fair penalty therefrom.

III. **CONSIDERATENESS.** Law is obliged to regard the general good, the welfare of the community at large, the result of action and of permission in the end and upon the whole. It therefore often bears severely on individual men. But it must not be inconsiderate. Where it can right one man that has been wronged it must do so. “He that killeth a beast, he shall restore it” (ver. 21).

## IV. IMPARTIALITY. (Ver. 22.)

V. INSTRUCTIVENESS. Law should not only decide individual cases, and bring down appropriate penalty on individual transgressors; it should also, by its embodiment of Divine principles, be a most effective teacher of truth, a constant instructor in righteousness. The law of the land should be daily leading the nation to true conceptions of what is upright, moral, estimable. These few statutes contain that vital principle, the *supreme value of human* (as compared with animal) *nature*. If a man killed his fellow-man, he must die; if he killed a beast, he must restore it (vers. 17, 18, 21). There are too many who (1) treat themselves or (2) treat others as if there were nothing more in human nature than in the "beasts that perish." *How much is a man better than a sheep?* He is better by the immeasurable height of his intelligent, responsible, spiritual, immortal nature. Let us estimate our own worth, and recognize the preciousness, before God, of the meanest soul that walks by our side along the path of human life. We may add that we see here—

VI. ROOM FOR FURTHER REVELATION. Righteous law, applicable to all, vindicated by just administrators, without a trace of personal resentment, says, "an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth." But beside this righteous law, consistent with it while high above it, is the spirit of individual, generous forgiveness. Where duty to society does not demand it, let the spirit of retaliation, so natural to unrenewed humanity, give place to the spirit of magnanimity,—the spirit of Jesus Christ, the Great Teacher (Matt. v. 38-41), the Divine Exemplar (Luke xxiii. 34).—O.

Vers. 10-12.—*A blasphemer punished.* An incident is here inserted that explains part of the Law by pointing to its origin. It is a practical illustration that throws lurid light upon the possibility and consequences of transgression.

I. THE SIN. It is described as blasphemy. 1. *A sin of the tongue.* Not the light matter some deem it. The tongue can cut like a sword. We need to take heed to our ways, lest we sin with the tongue. The prayer befits us, "Set a watch, O Lord, before my mouth." A word quickly spoken may have lasting results. What a power for good or evil is placed within our reach! 2. *Its criminal character.* The Name of God is to be had in reverence. This man sinned against the third commandment. If it be treason to speak ill of the ruler, how much more to utter with contempt the Name of the King of kings! Lost to all sense of propriety must he be who can curse God. Far from this, his Name should not even be jestingly or frivolously mentioned, nor should he be called to witness in our casual remarks.

II. ITS CAUSES. 1. *The immediate cause was strife.* This rouses angry passions and leads to worse sin. The beginning of strife is as the letting out of water; none can foretell how far it will spread. Little, perhaps, did this man suspect that the quarrel would end in his speedy death. Let the rivulet of contention be checked, ere it develop into a torrent! Men heated by a dispute will give utterance to sentiments of which in calmer moments they would be ashamed. 2. *The remote cause was marriage with an unbeliever.* This man's mother had espoused an Egyptian, and the son would appear to have followed the religion of his father, for, wishing to taunt an Israelite, he reviled the Name of Israel's God. Imprudent alliances are a source of continual grief and disappointment. The mother had the pain of beholding her son put to death with every mark of ignominy. The advice of the Apostle Paul with respect to marrying an ungodly person is based on religious principle, and its worth is confirmed by the dictates of common sense and the facts of experience. It is not desirable that there should be a difference of opinion on matters of religion between the husband and the wife. The loss of the children is great when they are not trained in ways of piety by the hearty co-operation of their parents.

III. THE PUNISHMENT. It is not surprising that the people should have been so astounded at such wickedness that they requested Jehovah to instruct them concerning the penalty adequate to the offence. The punishment made known and inflicted was *severe*, revealing God's estimate of the enormity of the sin; *swift*, lest the conscience of the people now aroused should have time to slumber, and lest hope of a reprieve should in after-days lead to licence of language. It was *inflicted by the whole congregation*, to rid themselves of any guilt of tacit participation in the crime; the nation must avenge the insult perpetrated upon its covenant Head. The penalty was *not averted by ex-*

*tenuating pleas* of race or passion. *It gave occasion for the enactment of the law of retribution.* The *lex talionis* has a rude justice about it which appeals to the sentiment of uncivilized nations. King Bezek acknowledged its force (Judg. i. 7). This retribution was allowed at first because of the hardness of men's hearts, but being permitted to run side by side with the law of love to one's neighbour and the stranger, the way was prepared for the Christian rule by which the waters of the former current are merged in the strength and beauty of the stream of love. Even under this dispensation, however, the law of love has its equitable as well as forgiving aspects.—S. R. A.

Vers. 10—23.—*The law of death.* Blasphemy, murder, wilful injury, whether by Israelite or stranger, judged and punished on the principle of compensation without mercy (cf. Isa. xii.; Rom. xi.).

I. Here is the evil of a fallen nature and an apostate people set forth (see Rom. i, ii.). “All have sinned.” Israel itself is defiled.

II. The contrast suggested between the law of death and the law of life (cf. Sermon on the Mount and Rom. vii., viii.). The true glory to the Name of Jehovah is not the death of the blasphemer, but the life of God's people. What the Law could not do, i.e. restore the injured, heal the wound, give back the life, is done by the grace of the gospel.

III. Historical illustrations of the insufficiency of the Law in the hands of a fallen race. Jesus accused of blasphemy. Stephen stoned. Paul treated as violator of the Law. Through the Jews and their defection the Name of Jehovah blasphemed in the world. The *lex talionis* no real protection either of the individual or society.—R.

## EXPOSITION.

### CHAPTER XXV.

The subject of the sacred seasons is taken up again in this chapter, after the parenthetical insertion of ch. xxiv. There remain the septennial festive season and that of the half-century—the sabbatical year and the jubilee.

The sabbatical year was instituted not for any supposed physical benefit accruing from it to the land, but, first, as serving for a link between the sabbath and the jubilee by means of the sacred number seven—the sabbatical year being the seventh year, and the jubilee being the year following the seven-times-seventh year; and secondly, and chiefly, as enforcing the lesson of the weekly sabbath in a manner that could not be overlooked, and symbolically teaching the universal application of the sabbatical law, even where physical needs were not concerned, and in that way suggesting the expectation of a rest to be hereafter attained by all God's creatures. The sabbatical year began with the commencement of the civil year, the 1st of Tisri, just before the autumn sowings, which were intermitted for one year. The ground was not tilled during this year (ver. 4). There was a release of debts (Deut. xv. 1—11), and there was to be

public reading of God's Law (Deut. xxxi. 10—13). During the previous six years the husbandmen had been well aware of the coming sabbatical year, and would have laid by in store accordingly, so as to support themselves and their families during that year. The release of debts inculcated mercy. The command that the Law should be publicly read showed that the intention of the institution was not that the year should be spent in idleness, but that the time saved from ordinary labour was to be given to devotional pursuits. The law of the sabbatical year was so hard of observance by an agricultural people, that it was seldom or never acted upon until the Captivity (see 2 Chron. xxxvi. 21). But after that time it seems to have been religiously kept (see Josephus, ‘Ant.’ xi. 8, 6; xiv. 10, 6; xiv. 16, 2; xv. 1, 2; 1 Macc. vi. 49; Gal. iv. 10; Tacit., ‘Hist.’ v. 2, 4).

The jubilee was a joyous year appointed to be observed every fifty years. The cycle of the sabbatical year and the jubilee touched without coalescing. The forty-ninth year was necessarily a sabbatical year, and the following year was the jubilee. It has appeared to some so difficult to believe that two years in which it was not allowable to engage in agricultural work should come

together, that they have assumed that the sabbatical year itself, that is, the forty-ninth year, was the year of the jubilee. But this was clearly not the case. Twice in the century the land was to lie fallow for two years running—from September to the second September following—special preparations having, of course, been made by laying up a store of grain from the abundant harvest promised in the previous year (ver. 21), and foreign crops being, no doubt, imported to take the place of the usual home crops. In matter of fact, however, these two blank years seldom, if ever, occurred together; for as the sabbatical year was not observed before the Captivity, while there are indications of the existence of the jubilee (1 Kings xxi. 3; Isa. lxi. 1—3), so probably the jubilee ceased to be observed after the Captivity, when the sabbatical year was carefully kept. Supposing that they did come together, the second year in which labour was prohibited would end just in time for the seed to be sown for the next summer's harvest.

The jubilee affected both land and men. Land could only be sold for fifty years, its value immediately after a jubilee had passed being that of fifty harvests, or rather, deducting the sabbatical years and the fiftieth year, of forty-two harvests. If it were sold, it might be bought back by the original owner or any of his relations, counting the number of harvests remaining before the next jubilee, and buying out the previous purchaser with the sum of money thus estimated. No more effective plan could be well devised for preserving the various properties in the families to which they were at first assigned.

The other point chiefly affected by the law of the jubilee was slavery. In case a brother Israelite became poor, it was the duty of his richer brethren to help him, and to lend him money without interest, to set him up in the world again. But if this did not succeed, the poor man might sell himself as a slave, either to an Israelite or to a foreigner living in the land. In the former case it had been already enacted that his slavery was not to last beyond six years (Exod. xxi. 2). To this enactment it was now added that he must be also set free whenever the year of jubilee occurred.

If he became the slave of a non-Israelite, he must be set free, not as before on the seventh year of his slavery, but still at the jubilee. He had also preserved for him the right of being redeemed by any kinsman, the price paid for him being the wages which would be paid up to the next jubilee. In either case, he was to be treated without rigour, and it was the duty of the Israelite magistrate to see that no undue harshness was used by the foreign master. The principle is, as before, that as the land is God's land, not man's, so the Israelites were the slaves of God, not of man, and that if the position in which God placed them was allowed to be interfered with for a time, it was to be recovered every seventh, or at furthest every fiftieth, year. The possession of slaves was not forbidden—the world was not yet ready for such a prohibition. The Hebrews might purchase and own slaves of alien blood, but between Hebrew and Hebrew the institution of master and slave was practically abolished, and superseded (in most respects) by the relationship of master and servant.

Ver. 1.—And the Lord spake unto Moses in mount Sinai. The purpose of the words, *in Mount Sinai*, is not to distinguish the place in which the sabbatical law and the law of the jubilee were given from that in which the preceding laws were delivered. The words mean only, “in the Sinai district;” and they are employed because these laws form the conclusion of the series of laws given while the people were encamped under Mount Sinai. The law on vows is, it is true, added to them, but it is by way of appendix.

Vers. 2—7.—The sabbath of the seventh year could only be observed when ye come into the land which I give you. The habit of making no distinction in the seventh year during the whole of the life in the wilderness may have led to the neglect of the law after the settlement in Canaan. Another excuse for the neglect may have been a difficulty which would have presented itself of fixing the date from which to count up to the seventh year, as different parts of the land were conquered at different times. According to the law, from New Year's Day of the seventh year (the 1st of Tisri, which occurred about the middle of September) to the following New Year's Day, there was to be neither sowing nor pruning, reaping or gathering. The expression, *Neither shalt thou gather the grapes of thy vine undressed*, would be more literally rendered, *the grapes of thy Nazarite*.

vine, the vine with its unpruned tendrils, being likened to the Nazarite with his unshorn locks. As to sowing and reaping, an exception was made with respect to the barley sown and reaped for the Passover sheaf, and the wheat sown and reaped for the Pentecost loaves. The spontaneous fruits of the earth, and they were very large in the rich fields of the valleys and plains, were to be the property of all alike, whether the owners of the land or not, "that the poor of thy people might eat" (Exod. xxiii. 11). And what was left by man was to be food for the cattle and beasts of the field. The cessation of agricultural labours must have served, and may have been intended to serve, as an encouragement to mercantile pursuits, as well as to the study of the Divine Law (Deut. xxxi. 10—13). The Feast of Tabernacles of the seventh year was specially appointed by Moses as a day for reading the Law to the assembled people (Deut. xxxi. 10—13). And the Mishna appoints the following passages of Deuteronomy to be read on that day:—Deut. i. 1—6; vi. 4—8; xi. 13—22; xiv. 22; xv. 23; xvii. 14; xxvi. 12—19; xxvii., xxviii. ('Mish. Sotah,' vii. 8). The other ordinance connected with the sabbatical year, the release of debts to the poor (Deut. xv. 1—6), was, like the fifth commandment, made of none effect by rabbinical traditions—notably by one which required a debtor, when his creditor said, "I remit," to insist that nevertheless he should accept payment. The moral purpose of the sabbath of the seventh year is well drawn out by Keil:—"In the sabbatical year the land which the Lord had given his people was to observe a period of holy rest and refreshment to its Lord and God, just as the congregation did on the sabbath day; and the hand of man was to be withheld from the fields and fruit gardens from working them that they might yield their produce for his use. The earth was to be sacred from the hand of man, exhausting its power for earthly purposes as his own property, and to enjoy the holy rest with which God had blessed the earth and all its productions after the Creation. From this, Israel, as the nation of God, was to learn, on the one hand, that although the earth was created for man, it was not merely created for him to draw out its power for his own use, but also to be holy to the Lord and participate in the blessed rest; and on the other hand, that the great purpose for which the congregation of the Lord existed did not consist in the uninterrupted tilling of the earth, connected with bitter labour in the sweat of the brow (Gen. iii. 17, 19), but in the peaceful enjoyment of the fruits of the earth, which the Lord their God had given them and would give them still, without the

labour of their hands, if they strove to keep his covenant and satisfy themselves with his grace."

Vers. 8, 9.—The word *jubile* (as it is always spelt in the Authorized Version) is taken from the Hebrew word *yorel*, and it came to mean a year of liberty (Ezek. xlvi. 17; Josephus, 'Ant.' iii. 12, 3), because it freed men and lands from the obligations to which they would otherwise have been liable; but originally it signified no more than a cornet-blast, and thence the year of the cornet-blast. The way to find the jubilee year was to number seven sabbaths of years, that is, seven weeks of years (ch. xxii. 15), seven times seven years; and the space of the seven sabbaths of years shall be unto thee forty and nine years; then by a blast of the cornet (the word is inexactely rendered trumpet) on the tenth day of the seventh month, in the day of atonement, the approach of the jubilee in the following year was announced.

Vers. 10.—This verse contains a short statement of the two purposes of the jubilee: (1) to proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof; (2) ye shall return every man unto his possession.

Vers. 11, 12.—So far as the tilling of the land went, the jubilee year was to have the same effect as a sabbatical year.

Vers. 13—17.—The Israelites were only tenants of God. They might regard themselves as owners for fifty years, but at the end of every fifty years the land was to come back to him to whom the Lord had assigned it, or to his representative. It might be bought and sold on that understanding, the value of the purchase being found by reckoning the price of the harvests up to the next jubilee day; but in this period only "the years of the fruits" were to be counted, that is, the sabbatical years, in which there would be no harvests, were to be deducted. Ye shall not therefore oppress (or overreach) one another by demanding more for the land than would be its just value under the limitation of the jubilee law.

Vers. 18—22.—"Not only the year of jubilee, but the sabbatical year also, commenced in the autumn, when the farmers first began to sow for the coming year; so that the sowing was suspended from the autumn of the sixth year till the autumn of the seventh, and even till the autumn of the eighth whenever the jubilee year came round, in which case both sowing and reaping were omitted for two years in succession, and consequently the produce of the sixth year, which was harvested in the seventh month of that year, must have sufficed for three years, not merely till the sowing in the autumn of the eighth or fiftieth year, but till the harvest

of the ninth or fifty-first year, as the Talmud and rabbins of every age have understood the law" (Keil). The question, What shall we eat? would present itself with double force when the sabbatical and the jubilee years came together. It and the answer to it therefore properly follow on the institution of the jubilee, instead of preceding it, as Ewald, Knobel, and others demand that it should do.

Vers. 23, 24.—For the land is mine; for ye are strangers and sojourners with me. Many incidental advantages, if some difficulties, arose from the jubilee law (which will be the more appreciated if we compare the evils resulting from slavery and the accumulation of land in a few hands, found in the history of Rome or any other ancient nation); but its essential features, so far as the land was concerned, was its inculcation of the lesson of the proprietorship of the Lord. Palestine was God's land: he divided it once for all in the time of Joshua among his people, and every fifty years he required that recourse should be had to that original division, in order that in each generation the people might feel themselves to be his tenants, not independent owners, *possessores*, not *domini*.

Vers. 25—28.—The right of redemption of land sold continued always alive, and might be exercised by the original owner or his kinsman. If not exercised, the owner returned into his possession at any rate in the jubilee year. If a man had to sell his land, he was bound to offer it to his nearest kinsman first (see Jer. xxxii. 7, 8).

Vers. 29—31.—Houses in walled cities are not subject to the law of restoration at the jubilee, as that law applies only to lands and to men; but houses in the country are subject to the law, as they are regarded only as appurtenances of the land. Houses in cities, being occupied by artisans and built by human industry, not originally assigned in the territorial division, are not considered in so strict a sense the property of the Lord as the soil is, and may be parted with more readily. Yet the owners, if obliged to part with them, are allowed a year's grace, during which they are to have the right of buying them back. The expression, within a full year, would be more literally rendered *during a fixed time*, that fixed time having just before been declared to be a year.

Vers. 32—34.—The houses of the Levites are, by an exception, subject to the law of jubilee. They constituted the share of the national property which was assigned to the tribe of Levi, and so far stood in the same relation to them as the land did to the other tribes. They therefore returned to the original possessor or his represen-

tative in the year of jubilee, and might at any earlier time be redeemed. The words, Notwithstanding the cities of the Levites, should rather be rendered, *But in respect to the cities of the Levites*. There is a difficulty also as to the translation of the clause, And if a man purchase of the Levites, for the word rendered *purchase* means elsewhere *redeem*; but here the Authorized Version would seem to be correct. The sense that it gives is that if any one bought a house of the Levites, he had to render it back in the year of jubilee, just as though it had been land. On the other hand, the land belonging to the Levites, in the suburbs of the Levitical cities, which was used for the pasture of the flocks of the Levites, could not be sold except to a Levite, and therefore no question between the Levites and members of the other tribes could arise regarding it. The phrase, the house that was sold, and the city of his possession, must be understood, by a hendiadys, to mean, *the house that was sold in the city of his possession* (see Gesenius, 'Lex.', s.v. <sup>b</sup>i.b.).

Vera. 35—38.—Slavery. It is presumed that no Hebrew will become a slave except on the pressure of poverty, and this poverty his brethren are commanded to relieve; but foreseeing that either want of charity on the part of the rich or unthrift on the part of the poor would certainly bring about slavery, the legislator makes regulations so as to soften its character as far as possible. The literal translation of ver. 35 is as follows: If thy brother becomes poor, and his hand faileth by thee, thou shalt lay hold of him; a stranger or a sojourner that he may live with thee. The translation of the latter clause adopted by the Authorized Version, *yea, though he be a stranger, or a sojourner; that he may live with thee*, makes the duty of giving charitable support and loans of money to apply to the case of the stranger and sojourner as well as of the Israelite. The other and more probable rendering confines its application to native Israelites. *If thy brother becomes poor, and his hand faileth, thou shalt support him as a stranger or a sojourner*, that is, treat him with the forbearance shown to resident foreigners, to whose state he had reduced himself by the loss of his land. The command in ver. 36, Take thou no usury of him, or increase, does not bear upon the general question of taking interest for money when lent to wealthy men or companies for business purposes. It simply forbids the taking of interest or increase of a brother Israelite who had become poor. The history of Rome shows how much cruelty and revolution such an injunction may have prevented. The words, or increase, added to *usury*, forbid the exactation of any greater quantity of food or

clothing (a method of evading the law against usury) than that which had been lent. The injunction was transgressed in the time of Nehemiah, when "he rebuked the nobles, and the rulers, and said unto them, Ye exact usury, every one of his brother. . . . Then held they their peace, and found nothing to answer" (Neh. v. 7, 8).

Vers. 39—42.—We see the way in which a poor Israelite might become a slave in the case of the sons of the widow whose oil was multiplied by Elisha. "Thy servant my husband is dead; (and thou knowest that thy servant did fear the Lord:) and the creditor is come to take unto him my two sons to be bondmen" (2 Kings iv. 1). And in the time of Nehemiah, "Some also there were that said, We have mortgaged our lands, vineyards, and houses, that we might buy corn, because of the dearth. . . . And, lo, we bring into bondage our sons and our daughters to be servants, and some of our daughters are brought unto bondage already: neither is it in our power to redeem them; for other men have our lands and vineyards" (Neh. v. 3—5). But the fact that an Israelite could not be kept in slavery for more than six years (Exod. xxi. 2), and that the period of his service had to be still shorter if the jubilee fell before the seventh year, and the further fact that at the time of the jubilee he would not only be free, but recover any ancestral property that he had forfeited, so that he might become once more on an equality with his master, would have made his position

totally different from the hopeless, helpless state of the Greek or Roman slave, even without the positive command that he was to be treated, not as a bondservant: but as an hired servant, and as a sojourner. All alike, master and bondsman, were the slaves of God, and therefore not only were they, so far, on an equality one with another, but the master would be encroaching on the right of God if he claimed God's slaves for his own inalienably.

Vers. 43.—Thou shalt not rule over him with rigour; but shalt fear thy God, is paralleled by the New Testament injunction, "And, ye masters, do the same things unto them, forbearing threatening: knowing that your Master also is in heaven; neither is there respect of persons with him" (Eph. vi. 9).

Vers. 44—46.—Slavery is not forbidden in respect to non-Israelites. The world was not yet ready for it, as it was not ready in the days of St. Paul.

Vers. 47—55.—Rules are laid down for the case of an Israelite who has sold himself for a slave to a non-Israelite. In this case he is not set free at the end of six years, as he would be if his master were a countryman, but in other respects his treatment is to be like that of the man with an Israelite master. He may be redeemed by the value of his work down to the jubilee being paid by himself or his kinsman; he is to be set free when the jubilee comes at any rate; he is to be treated kindly while continuing in his master's service, and his countrymen are to see that no over-severity is used.

## HOMILETICS.

Vers. 8—34.—The jubilee, being a year of deliverance and joy, came to be a type of the Messianic dispensation, and of the final deliverance and state of happiness which is still to come. "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound; to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord" (Isa. lxi. 1, 2). We have our Lord's authority for saying that these words bear spiritual reference to his ministry on earth (Luke iv. 21). They are partially fulfilled in his kingdom here, and will be fully accomplished at "the restitution of all things" (Acts iii. 21) in his kingdom hereafter, when his people shall "rest from their labours" and be delivered from the burden of their debts and emancipated for ever from slavery.

Vers. 35—55.—*The power of slavery was undermined, not at once destroyed, by the Bible.* I. IN THE OLD TESTAMENT. It is accepted as a fact, not denounced or approved, but recognized and gradually ameliorated. 1. Hebrew slaves are not to be treated with rigour (vers. 43, 53), but as hired servants. How different from the state of slaves in the workshops of Greece and Rome! 2. In the case of Hebrew slaves, the duration of slavery was not to be perpetual. At the end of six years every slave was to be restored to liberty, and at the end of fifty years at the utmost he was to be replaced in a social position which might equal his master's (vers. 28, 54).

**II. IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.** It is still accepted as a fact. But: 1. A principle is laid down, which, like leaven leavening the whole lump, could not but cause its destruction. "Ye masters . . . your Master also" (or, as it would be better translated, "your and their Master") "is in heaven; neither is there respect of persons with him" (Eph. vi. 9). "Ye call me Master and Lord: and ye say well; for so I am. If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet; ye also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you" (John xiii. 13—15). "Art thou called being a servant (slave)? care not for it: but if thou mayest be made free, use it rather. For he that is called in the Lord, being a servant (slave), is the Lord's freeman: likewise also he that is called, being free, is Christ's servant (slave)" (1 Cor. vii. 21, 22). "There is neither . . . bond nor free: but Christ is all, and in all" (Col. iii. 11). 2. An example is given. St. Paul thus speaks of Onesimus, the runaway slave, now converted to Christianity: "I beseech thee for my son Onesimus, whom I have begotten in my bonds: . . . thou therefore receive him, that is, mine own bowels. . . . For perhaps he therefore departed for a season, that thou shouldest receive him for ever; not now as a servant (slave), but above a servant (slave), a brother beloved, specially to me, but how much more unto thee, both in the flesh, and in the Lord? If thou count me therefore a partner, receive him as myself" (Philem. 10—17). Contrast the feeling entertained contemporaneously towards slaves in the Roman Empire. "Their growing power was sometimes restrained by legalized murder; they were sold without remorse; they were tortured and beaten and crucified without pity. Even Cicero apologizes to Atticus for being affected by the death of his slave" (Wordsworth, 'Church History,' ch. xxiii.).

**III. TEACHING IN THE SECOND CENTURY.** "We ought," says Clement of Alexandria, "to treat our slaves as ourselves. They are men as we are; and there is the same God of bond and free; and we ought not to punish our brethren when they sin, but to reprove them. Whatever we do to the lowest and meanest of Christ's brethren, we do to him" ('Pædag.', p. 307, as quoted by Wordsworth).

**IV. SLOW BUT CERTAIN EXTINCTION OF SLAVERY.** There was a long battle to be fought between the selfish and the Christian instinct; but slavery could not coexist with Christianity, and wherever Christianity now stretches, slavery, though it may still linger here and there, is condemned by public sentiment and doomed to extinction.

#### HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

**The fallow year.** Ch. xxv. 1—7; cf. Deut. xxxi. 10—13. We have here a ceremonial appendix to the fourth commandment. The land must have its sabbath as well as man, and so every seventh year was to be fallow year for the ground. The necessity of giving land rest is recognized still in agriculture. Continual cropping impoverishes a soil, and reduces it eventually to barrenness. This was one of the grave charges made by political economists against the slavery of North America, that, in consequence of the inefficiency of slave labour, the land was subjected to a monotonous process of cropping, and in consequence killed. The finest virgin soil was being reduced to wilderness, for the land was allowed neither variety nor rest.<sup>1</sup> This arrangement in Israel, therefore, was economically most wise. But "the sabbath of the fields" had a wider basis than this mere natural one. It was attended by most important religious results.

**I. THE FALLOW YEAR PROCLAIMED THAT THE LAND BELONGED TO THE LORD.** For if the fourth commandment really implies that the people, called from their own work to do God's work on God's day, belong to him, and so are under obligation to obey this call, in the very same way the claim that the land should rest proclaims that the land is his. What was thus claimed in Canaan is only part of a still wider claim; for "the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof; the world, and they that dwell therein. For he hath founded it upon the seas, and established it upon the floods" (Ps. xxiv. 1, 2). The demand for "a sabbath of rest unto the land" is for "a sabbath for the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Cairnes' 'Slave Power,' p. 56, etc.

Lord." He thus stamps the land as his, and had we the clear vision, we might see the "sign manual" of the Lord upon all the world.

II. THE FALLOW YEAR CHANGED AGRICULTURAL INTO PASTORAL LIFE. The people of necessity gave greater attention to the rearing and the tending of cattle. It is evident from ver. 7 that the care of the cattle and of the beasts of the field was specially contemplated by the arrangement. National life would become in consequence more *idyllic*. A wholesome change would thus be introduced every seventh year, and the people would morally be improved. The population would become more and more humane, and the whole country profit thereby.

Now, in pastoral countries there is of necessity more time for pensive meditation and thought. Pastoral life is in the interests of reflection. It is a providential aid thereto. Hence we see in the sabbatic year the condition supplied for greater thoughtfulness and reflection. If we compare the blank intellectual condition of agricultural labourers, ground down by ceaseless toil, with the thoughtful, poetic mood often met with among shepherds, we can have no difficulty in recognizing the great moral importance of a pastoral year.

III. THE FALLOW YEAR WAS A FINE EXERCISE FOR THE NATIONAL FAITH. For men would naturally ask, "What shall we eat the seventh year?" (ver. 20). And to this the Lord made answer, "Then I will command my blessing upon you in the sixth year, and it shall bring forth fruit for three years" (ver. 21). For a nation to prepare for this fallow year required great faith in God. The sixth year was a year of "great expectations;" they looked to God to provide for the coming year of rest, and thus were drawn up to an exercise of faith and hope of the most profitable description. Amid our multiplied methods of livelihood we are in danger of losing sight of the Divine hand altogether, and of living a low life of sight. And yet, by periodic returns of hard times and difficulties, the Lord is still calling on us for faith in him, to enable us to serve him. He still desires us to exercise this faith in him, that none of us shall ever suffer real loss in seeking to serve him. "So those who abstain from their labours upon the sabbath," says an old writer in this connection, "it shall never impoverish them, for the blessing of God upon the week-days shall supply all their wants; so the Lord promised, when they shall go up to Jerusalem to serve him at their feasts, that he would keep their land from the incursion of their enemies (Exod. xxxiv. 24). We see also (Josh. v. 1, 2), when they were circumcised, the Lord struck such a fear and terror into the hearts of the Canaanites, that they durst not touch them, as Simeon and Levi killed the Shechemites when they were newly circumcised. Never man yet got hurt in the service of God; he shall still find the Lord's protecting hand and blessing in his service."

IV. THE FALLOW YEAR BROUGHT INTO PROMINENCE THE GREAT TRUTH ABOUT THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN. Although the land was to lie fallow, it gave much in the way of spontaneous growth. This became public and common property, so that servant, and maid, and hired servant, and stranger, as well as the rightful owner, "had all things common." In fact, there was, to adopt the modern phraseology, a "commune" established in Canaan so far as the produce of the sabbatic year was concerned. Was this not a recognition of the brotherhood of man, and of the obligation to make some provision for poorer brethren? It was thus the year of *charity*, when all alike sat at the table of the Divine bounty, and realized therat their common relation.

It was a similar outcome of the religious spirit which occurred at Pentecost. Then "the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and of one soul: neither said any of them that ought of the things which he possessed was his own; but they had all things common" (Acts iv. 32). And although the Christian commune did not work well, but broke down speedily, it showed the true tendency of inspired men. The obligation under which they live to do their best for all about them, especially for those of the household of faith, is cheerfully and gladly recognized. And possibly, in the perfect world and sabbath of the spirit, this community of goods will be found workable, the selfish elements which now cause friction having entirely disappeared.

V. THE FALLOW YEAR AFFORDED SPECIAL FACILITIES FOR PROMOTING NATIONAL EDUCATION. It is evident from Deut. xxxi. 10—13 that the sabbatic year was to be a season of special study of the Law. The Feast of Tabernacles with which it began was to be devoted to the public reading of it. Not only the adults, male and female, but

also the children, were to be instructed in it. So that the national desire might very properly find its expression in the words of the Psalm (cxix. 19), which celebrates the Divine Law, "I am a stranger in the earth: hide not thy commandments from me." A pilgrim people in extemporized tents applied themselves in the sabbatic year to the study of God's commandments.

Thus national education was promoted, and this education was of such a character that "the revival of religion" must have resulted if the sabbatic years had been faithfully kept. It would seem from such a passage as *Jer. xxxiv. 14*, however, that Israel was not careful about the sabbatic year, and the result was judgment without mercy (*Jer. xxxiv. 17—22*). The institution was most valuable, morally and spiritually, but it was disregarded by an apostatizing people, who came in consequence into an inheritance of judgment rather than of blessing.—R. M. E.

*The jubilee.* Ch. xxv. 8—55; cf. *Isa. lxi. 1—13*; *Luke iv. 18, 19*. We have here a further appendix to the fourth commandment. After seven sabbatic years there came another year, called the jubilee, which was also sabbatic, and during which there was to be a universal restitution. The trumpet was to be blown on the Day of Atonement, and the captives were then to be released, the unfortunate ones who had been compelled to part with their inheritance had it restored to them, and there was a general restoration of heart and of hope throughout the land. It was the year of liberty, of comfort, of restoration; in one word, it was every half-century a *bloodless revolution*, giving to the entire nation the opportunity of a new departure.

I. **THE JUBILEE WAS PRE-EMINENTLY THE LORD'S, AND AS SUCH WAS A HALLOWED YEAR.** The fallow year was a year of rest unto the land, the jubilee was a year of liberty and release unto the people, and, as the year which was reached after a series of seven sabbatic years, it was hallowed as no other year was hallowed, to the service of the Lord. His will ruled all the year, just as his will is pre-eminently regarded on the sabbath days. Now, the principle embodied in the jubilee was this: "All members of the community are the direct servants of Jehovah, not the servants of men, and they must therefore have an unfettered body and unencumbered estate, in order to live worthy of their vocation."<sup>1</sup> Hence God gave his people in the jubilee who had become "servants of men" through the pressure of the times, release from their bondage; he gave those of them who had disposed of their estates, which they could only dispose of until the jubilee, a new gift of their inheritance; he gave every exile from his home and family through the exigencies of the times, right to return to his family and begin life amid the old associations and without encumbrance. This was surely to show that his service is perfect freedom, and that when his will is done on earth as it ought to be, men shall have such social privileges and such adequate temporal provision as will make life an antepast of heaven!

The only exception to the law of restoration was the case of a house in a walled town, which, if not redeemed within a year, might become the inalienable inheritance of the buyer. It was only by some little possibility of this kind that the stranger could have any footing in the holy land at all. The growth of cities, and of the civilization which cities bring, was thus provided for. If every house as well as field reverted to its former owners, every jubilee would have witnessed an emigration of all but the descendants of the old proprietors, and business would have been brought to an utter standstill. We see in this exception the possibility of a foreign and advantageous element amid the native population.

II. **THERE WAS A SLAVERY WHICH TERMINATED, AND A SLAVERY WHICH DID NOT TERMINATE, IN THE YEAR OF THE JUBILEE.** The slavery which did terminate was that into which a Jewish debtor had entered, in order to give his service in lieu of the debt. In fact, slavery was the form that the bankruptcy laws took in Palestine. It would be well if some such system were grafted on our own jurisprudence. A man who has got unfortunately into difficulties might thus honourably redeem his position and his character, instead of compromising both by availing himself of present legal facilities.

On the other hand, foreigners or natives of Canaan might become perpetual slaves to

<sup>1</sup> Ewald's 'Antiquities of Israel,' pp. 378, 379.

the Jews. In so doing, they shared in Jewish privileges, and had the advantage of Jewish training. This was compensation for the loss of their freedom. Besides, their considerate treatment was carefully secured by the Law of God. It was right, therefore, that it should thus be unmistakably exhibited that other nations were only "hewers of wood and drawers of water" to the Lord's own people. This was what slavery among the Jews embodied.

III. THE JUBILEE WAS THE TYPE OF GOSPEL TIMES. Our Lord appropriated the prophecy delivered by Isaiah, "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound; to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord" (Isa. lxi. 1, 2; cf. Luke iv. 18, 19). We are living consequently amid the glorious privileges of the Lord's acceptable year. The gospel, as preached to men, is the trumpet blown at the beginning of the jubilee. It is blown over the completed atoning sacrifice of Christ. It proclaims, therefore—

1. *The pardon of sin.* Sin constitutes the great debt, and as sin-burdened hearts feel, the pardon of sin is the great release. What a liberty forgiveness brings!

2. *The gospel proclaims freedom from the power of sin.* For if God gave us liberty to sin with impunity, it would be no real blessing. He gives us through Christ and his Spirit freedom from the dominion of sin. He takes away the love of sin, which is the real liberty.

3. *The gospel proclaims the sanctity of family life.* Just as in the jubilee broken family circles were restored again, and social enjoyments regained, so the gospel exalts the family as the unit, and sets its highest sanctions round the home.

4. *The gospel has wrought steadily towards the liberties of men.* For while there was no "servile war" proclaimed in the apostolic time, but seeds of liberty were left to fructify in the bosom of the race, we know they have sprung into vigorous being, and that it is pre-eminently to the force of gospel truth and principle the battle of freedom and its victory are due.

5. *And the gospel is the charter of all wise reform.* It might be shown that true progress and the bloodless revolutions of such countries as England and America are due to the force of gospel principles making their hallowed way among men. It is only so far as the will of God is regarded in the politics and policy of nations that true progress and needful revolutions shall be secured.

IV. THE JUBILEE IS ALSO THE TYPE OF THE EVERLASTING REST. "There remaineth," we are told, "a sabbatism to the people of God" (Heb. iv. 9). This jubilee of Creation is to be ushered in by the trump of God (1 Thess. iv. 16). And regarding the heavenly state, we may in this connection remark—

1. *That heaven will be an everlasting sabbath.* If the jubilee was a sabbath extending over a year, heaven is to be a sabbath extending over an eternity. All time, if such an element is recognized in eternity, will prove consecrated there.

2. *All wrongs shall then be righted.* All the burdens and injustices and sorrows which we endure here will give place in the jubilee of heaven to the utmost justice and the most scrupulous reward.

3. *The Divine family shall be complete.* The scattered children of God shall be restored to their rightful place in the great family circle, and the home-feeling shall be the heritage of all.

4. *And everlasting progress shall characterize the everlasting rest.* For if progress towards perfection is life's most real joy, we can see how heaven itself can afford a field for it. God's infinite nature and boundless operations will not be comprehended in a flash of intuition; but insight will be, let us thankfully believe, the steady growth of ages.—R. M. E.

Vers. 1—7, 18—22.—*The sabbatic year.* At the close of the original week the sabbath of the seventh day was given; that of the seventh year, on the entrance of the Hebrews into Canaan. The former was a memorial of creation; the latter, of redemption. These are intimately related. There are correspondences between the old creation and the new—the material and the spiritual. The grand effect of redemption will be the constitution of a new creation, in which the mundane system will participate.

I. THE SEVENTH YEAR WAS A "SABBATH OF THE LAND." Then: 1. *The soil remained untilled.* (1) In other years it was customary to sow the grain after the Feast of Ingathering, and the vines were pruned in the spring. While we are in this world the greater portion of our time should be occupied in its concerns. This is God's order. The thing in hand should be done with might. (2) In this year no seed was sown, and there was no dressing of vines. The affairs of this world must not engross all our time and care. (3) The sentiment of religion must be with us in our earthly business. Religion must limit the time it claims—the intensity with which it is pursued. Thus: 2. *The people were taught to trust God.* (1) They lived upon the natural productivity of the soil. But not without the blessing of God upon it. Natural productiveness without the blessing of God is a poor dependence. (2) With that blessing, such was the bounty of the sixth year that it carried the nation on to the harvest of the eighth (see vers. 21, 22). Thus miraculously was the fruit of three years brought forth in one. This was in perpetuity the miracle of the manna (Exod. xvi. 22; see also Matt. iv. 4). (3) What reply to this institution can those give who would convict Moses as an impostor? (see Exod. xxiii. 10, 11). No sensible man would have made such a law as this, unless he acted under Divine direction; for the sixth year would have refuted his pretensions. Thus also: 3. *The people were taught to hope in God.* (1) Every recurrence of the sabbatic year reminded them of the period before sin entered, in which the earth of its natural strength brought forth plenty. (2) In it too they anticipated the period when, through the redemption of the gospel, the curse shall be lifted from the earth, and men shall be released from the burden of labour (see Gen. iii. 17; iv. 11, 12; v. 29; also Isa. lxv. 17—25; Rom. viii. 18—23; Rev. xxii. 3).

II. THEN THE FRUIT OF THE LORD'S LAND WAS FREE. 1. *The land is the Lord's.* (1) In this law he asserted his right as Landlord to impose conditions upon his people when he gave them possession of Canaan. All God's gifts carry conditions. This should ever be remembered. (2) God's laws will regulate the new heavens and earth. They will not then be contravened. Happy will that state be. By loyalty to the laws of God we should now anticipate that state as much as in us lies. 2. *This year the tenant shared his benefits with all comers.* (1) What fruit came spontaneously was free to the poor—free to the stranger—free to the cattle—free even to the wild animal. What a lesson of generosity! of public spirit! of kindness to animals! Consider here also the Divine philosophy of rights in property. (2) Note that the resolution of the primitive Christian Church to have all things in common was not without precedent (see Acts ii. 44). Also that in the light of this precedent we may discern their purpose; and learn that when the Spirit shall be poured out upon all flesh, of which the baptism of the Pentecost was but an instalment, the consummation will be happy. (3) But how different are the theories of our socialists! Satan is an adept at setting up counterfeits. The idle vagabond has no objection to be the subject of love from others, if he can thereby live on their property. He would eat without working, in contravention of the apostolic rule (see 1 Thess. iv. 11, 12; 2 Thess. iii. 10). He has no conception of those spiritual blessings in connection with which alone communism is a happy possibility. (4) The feeding together of the cattle and wild animals points to the *universality* of the blessings of the gospel (see Isa. xi. 6—9; lvi. 7—9; Hos. ii. 18; Acts x. 11, 12). The feeding together of the stranger and poor Hebrew on the holding of the rich sets forth the *spirituality* of the gospel. These things will be blessedly realized in the sabbaths, viz. of the millennium, and of the heavenly world. 3. *There was a release from debts* (see Deut. xv. 1, 2). (1) The gospel truly is "the Lord's release." (2) This release will be perfected in the heavenly state.

III. THE LEISURE OF THIS YEAR WAS RELIGIOUSLY SPENT. 1. *The Law was publicly read* (see Deut. xxxi. 10, 11). (1) Our leisure should be largely given to the study of the Word of God. (2) Leisure should be made for this important duty. 2. *If not religiously used, leisure is fruitful in mischief.* (1) The want of a worthy aim is in itself a great mischief. The faculties suffer. (2) The want of a worthy aim implies the pursuit of that which demoralizes. We are constitutionally active. We cannot sleep away existence. (3) The curse of labour is a blessing in disguise. All God's curses crop up as blessings somewhere. This must be so, for he is essentially and everlasting Good. Men who retire from business should give their leisure to Church work.—J. A. M.

Vers. 8—17.—*The jubilee.* The sabbath of the seventh day is commemorative of the rest of God after the work of creation, and anticipative of the rest in heaven for his people after the world's great week of toil and sorrow (see Heb. iii., iv.). The more to impress these things upon us, to keep alive our gratitude, and to stimulate our faith and hope, he also instituted the sabbaths of the Levitical system. Conspicuous amongst these are the grand sabbaths mentioned in this chapter, viz. that of the seventh year and that of the week of years. This last comes now under review; and we notice—

I. **THE TIME OF THE JUBILEE.** 1. *In its astronomical aspect.* (1) It was regulated by the sun. It was reckoned from the entrance of the children of Israel into Canaan, and recurred at the time of the autumnal harvest. (2) It was also regulated by the moon. It was counted from the tenth day of the first month, that being the month in which Israel crossed the Jordan. (3) It was itself an important factor in reconciling solar and lunar time. Forty-nine years is a soli-lunar cycle. The interval from the tenth day of the first month of the year to the tenth of the seventh month of the forty-ninth year is exactly six hundred lunations. The sabbaths are all worked in, as elements of intercalation, and the intercalations of the Levitical system are very superior to those of the Gregorian (see 'Dissertation Concerning the Sabbath; and a Sabbatical Era,' in the third volume of King's 'Morsels of Criticism'). Who but God could have instituted a system so scientifically perfect? (see Gen. i. 14). 2. *In its theological aspect.* (1) The jubilee dated from the great Day of Atonement. Some compute that the very year in which Christ suffered was the year of jubilee, and the last of the Levitical series. (2) Its provisions were typical of gospel mysteries. As the jubilee ended the yoke and burden of the slave, so the bringing in of the gospel released us from the yoke and burden even of the ceremonial Law itself. (3) When the gospel is received by faith, it introduces us into a spiritual rest from the burden and yoke of sin. (4) The rest of the soul in Christ is an earnest of the rest in heaven. This last also springs from the great atonement of Calvary.

II. **THE PROCLAMATION OF THE JUBILEE.** 1. *This foreshadowed the preaching of the gospel.* (1) It was by sound of trumpet. Some suppose that the jubilee had its name (יובל) from a particular sound of the trumpet. The word *jobel* (יובל) is used for a trumpet in Exod. xix. 13. The gospel should have a certain sound (see 1 Cor. xiv. 8). (2) The trumpet was sounded over the sacrifices. This foreshowed the connection between the great atonement of Christ and the blessings of salvation. The preaching of the gospel is the preaching of the cross. "The great liberty or redemption from thraldom, published under the gospel, could not take place till the great atonement—the sacrifice of the Lord Jesus—had been offered up" (Clarke). (3) The trumpet was sounded throughout the land (ver. 9). (a) If the land of Canaan be taken as a specimen of the world at large, then was this a prophecy of the proclamation of the gospel to the ends of the earth (Matt. xxviii. 19; Mark xvi. 16; Col. i. 23). (b) But if the land be taken in a restricted sense as applicable to the people of the Law in contradistinction to the heathen, then the teaching is that those only who renounce sin by repentance are concerned in the blessings of the gospel. 2. *The trumpet also suggests the judgment.* (1) The *jobel*, or *trumpet*, sounded at the giving of the Law (Exod. xix. 13). It called attention to the Law as the standard by which we shall be judged. The trumpet will sound at the last day, (a) to awaken the dead (1 Cor. xv. 52); (b) to summon all men to the tribunal. (2) The jubilee trumpet was the trumpet of a seventh period. There was the trumpet of the seventh day; again, of the seventh year; and now again, of the sabbath of a week of sabbatic periods. To these correspond the seventh of the seven great trumpets of the Apocalypse, which proclaims the judgment. (3) While to the wicked the trumpet of the judgment is a fearful alarm, to the good it is a joyful sound. If we sing of judgment we must also sing of mercy (Ps. c. 1). The seventh trumpet heralds in the reign of peace.

III. **THE BLESSINGS OF THE JUBILEE.** 1. *It proclaimed a release.* (1) As to the person. The slave was released from the hand of his brother; from the hand of the stranger. Whom the Son maketh free is free indeed. (2) As to the land. Every man returned to his possession. Adam Clarke derives the word *jubilee* (יובל) from *hobil* (הוביל), to cause to bring back, because estates, etc., which had been alienated, were then brought back to their primitive owners. No true believer can be deprived of

his share in the land of promise (see Eph. i. 14; Heb. xi. 9—14). 2. *It was a season of joy.* (1) The poor then rejoiced in plenty. In the sabbatic year the fruit of the Lord's land was free. In the year of jubilee every man returned to his possession. (2) The generous rejoiced in the prosperity of the poor. No doubt there were churls. Such persons are never to be envied; least of all in a season of rejoicing. Heaven would be hell to the churl. (3) The spectacle of blessedness periodically witnessed in sabbatic years and jubilees encouraged generous habits of thought, feeling, and action. Happy is the people whose God is the Lord.—J. A. M.

Vers. 23—34.—*Redemption.* This subject is intimately connected with that of the jubilee; and the redemption of the Law prefigured that of the gospel, which also stands intimately related to the glorious jubilee of the great future. In this light we have to consider—

I. THE NATURE OF THE REDEMPTION. This we may view: 1. *In respect to the possession.* (1) Canaan may be taken as a specimen of the earth at large. The Hebrew word for that land (*רְמָם*) is the term also for the whole world. In the largest sense the earth was given to mankind for an inheritance (Gen. i. 28—29; Ps. viii. 5—9; cxv. 16). If the Israelites were ever reminded that they had their possession of Canaan from God (ver. 23), we must never forget that we have nothing that we receive not (John iii. 27; 1 Cor. iv. 7; Jas. i. 17). (2) The Hebrews held their possession upon the tenure of faith and obedience (Deut. i. 34—36; xxx. 15—20; Heb. iii. 18, 19). Such also is the tenure upon which the earth at large is held. And as the expulsion of Adam from Eden vividly brought home to him his forfeiture of right to the earth, so did the forfeiture of Canaan keep alive in the Israelite the remembrance of the consequences of the Fall. (3) The land of Canaan was not only a specimen of the earth at large, but also of a type of the new earth of the future. Eden also was a "like figure." Like the garden, Canaan was "the glory of all lands" (Deut. viii. 7—10; Ezek. xx. 6, 15). So in the institution of the law of redemption we have bodied forth the means by which we shall recover our interest in the earth (see Luke xxi. 28; Rom. viii. 23; Eph. i. 14; iv. 30). (4) While Satan is the god of this world, the true heir may be kept out of his inheritance, but his title cannot be ultimately defeated. This was one of the important lessons of the jubilee, and of the law of redemption (vers. 23, 24, 28; see also Eph. i. 4; Heb. xi. 9—14). (5) As the possessions of the Levites were inalienable (ver. 34), so the "kingdom of priests" shall for ever enjoy their possessions in the renovated earth (1 Pet. ii. 5; Rev. i. 6). We may view this subject: 2. *In respect to the person.* (1) By sin we have not only forfeited our right to Eden, to Canaan, to the old earth, to the new earth, but we have also become enslaved. The habit of evil is a chain of iron. The terror of death is formidable bondage. The tyranny of Satan is merciless. Bad enough to have our liberties sold to a fellow-man; but to be sold over to this "stranger" from the infernal world is intolerable. (2) But there is redemption for the Hebrew slave. He may redeem himself if he have the means. His next of kin has the right of redemption (vers. 25, 26). He may be redeemed by his brother Hebrew (see Neh. v. 8). So to the truly penitent, who like the Hebrews are the people of the Law, there is the redemption of the gospel. (3) But the Law has no provision for the redemption of the stranger who cannot purchase freedom for himself. Yet might he be the subject of mercy. The gospel reaches those whom the Law discourages. The pagan slave might become a Jewish proselyte, and be released in accordance with the Law. So those who are furthest off may in true repentance be brought nigh to God. (4) But the mercy of the gospel has its limits. It may be forfeited by obstinacy. It may also be forfeited by neglect. A year only is allowed in which to redeem a house in a city (ver. 80). The house is a common figure for the people; and the interpretation of the year of recovery may be seen in Isa. lxii. 2; lxiii. 4; 2 Cor. vi. 2. If taken in time, the whole city of God may be redeemed; but the period of probation missed, the case is hopeless. Consider—

II. THE QUALIFICATIONS OF THE REDEEMER. 1. *A slave might redeem himself.* (1) That is, if it be in the power of his hand. Under favourable conditions of earning and saving, this might become possible. (2) But when the slave is the sinner and he is in bondage to the justice of God, this is impossible. Our deeds are sin. And the wages of sin is death. 2. *The near kinsman is the legal redeemer.* (1) This kinsman was a

type of Christ. Bishop Patrick quotes a rabbi, who says, “This Redeemer is the Messiah, the Son of David.” Job speaks of Messiah as his Redeemer (xix. 25). So is he elsewhere termed in Scripture (see Isa. lix. 20; Rom. xi. 26). (2) To be qualified to redeem, Jesus became our Kinsman by taking up our nature. As any Hebrew brother might become a redeemer, so Jesus, in our flesh, became “the brother of every man,” that he might redeem. Job speaks of seeing his Redeemer in *his flesh*, or incarnate—for this I take to be the sense. (3) Every near kinsman may not have it in his power to become a *Goel* or Redeemer. No mere human being can give to God a ransom for his brother (Ps. xlix. 7). But Christ is a competent Redeemer, having in his Godhead all resources. (4) We can imitate Christ as redeemers of our brethren only by endeavouring instrumentally to recover them from the snares of Satan. (5) What a blessing is liberty! “Whom the Son maketh free is free indeed.”—J. A. M.

Vera. 35—55.—*Justice and mercy.* The equity of the Mosaic laws has striking illustrations in the words now under review. We see it—

I. IN THE KINDNESS ENJOINED TOWARDS THE POOR. 1. *Their necessities are to be relieved.* (1) Though they be strangers. The stranger “with” the Hebrew, and so, subject to his law, is recognized as a brother (see vera. 35, 36). (2) Usury is not to be taken from the poor. “That thy brother may live.” Rights of property must not override those of existence (Matt. vi. 25). “That thy brother may live *with thee*.” The hands of the poor are as necessary to the rich as is the wealth of the rich to the poor. 2. *The reasons for mercy are edifying.* (1) “I am the Lord your God.” I stand in covenant relationship to you. I have a right to require this of thee. (2) I “brought thee out of the land of Egypt.” The remembrance of thy miseries in Egypt should influence thee to consider those of the poor stranger by thee. (3) I “gave you the land of Canaan.” Gratitude to me should move thee. I can yet more gloriously reward thy mercy in giving thee inheritance in the heavenly Canaan.

II. IN THE KINDNESS ENJOINED TOWARDS THE SLAVE. 1. *The Hebrew must show it.* (1) Not to his brother only, but also towards the stranger. (2) Yet there is a difference. The Hebrew slave goes out in the jubilee; but the power of a Hebrew master over the stranger is not then removed. This law prefigured the dominion which the righteous will have over the wicked in the morning, viz. of the resurrection (see Ps. xlix. 14). (3) The stranger, by becoming a proselyte, might claim the privilege of the Hebrew. So may the wicked, by repentance towards God and faith in the Lord Jesus, become a Christian, and enjoy the privileges of the righteous. 2. *The stranger must show it.* (1) The stranger is presumed to be not so merciful as the Hebrew. Privileges of grace should make men generous. (2) The cruelty of the wicked must be restrained by the laws of the good.

III. IN THE DETERMINATION OF THE RANSOM PRICE. In this determination: 1. *The rate of wages is an element.* The principles of hired service should be remembered by masters in the treatment of slaves. 2. *This rate was then multiplied into the years prospective to the jubilee.* (1) This determination of the rate was in favour of the slave; for if the law had not settled it, then it must be settled by agreement, in which case the master would be in a position to drive a hard bargain to the prejudice of the slave. Law should, for the same reason, control the claims of landlords where they prejudice the rights of their tenantry. (2) In this law there is equity also with respect to the master. Any difference in the value to him of a slave over that of a hired servant is compensated in the risk of life, in which, after the redemption, he has now no pecuniary concern.

IV. IN THE DIFFERENCE OF THE LAW RELATING TO A COUNTRY HOUSE AS COMPARED WITH A HOUSE IN A WALLED CITY. 1. *The country house returned to the owner of the land.* (1) This house is presumed to be simply a residence. The inconvenience of removal of residence is not formidable. (2) To a Christian the removal of residence from this world should not be formidable. 2. *The house in the walled city did not so return.* (1) Such a house may be presumed to be a place of business. In this case, *establishment* in a locality is often of great importance. Landlords should consider the interests of their tenants as well as their own. (2) But within the first twelve months after the sale of a house in a walled city, the owner had a power of redemption. This was before the business could be said to be *established*. It gave the seller an

opportunity to repent of a bargain which may have been forced upon him by the pressure of a temporary necessity. (3) What a mercy that the sinner has space for repentance!—J. A. M.

Vers. 1—7.—*Divine discipline.* This was certainly one of the most striking institutions which God gave to Israel. It was, in a high degree, disciplinary. Rightly taken, it would engrave sacred truth on their minds more deeply and effectually than either word or rite. It was calculated—

I. To TEACH THEM THE TRUTH AS TO THE DIVINE OWNERSHIP. God claimed to be the One Proprietor of the land. He had given it to the nation by his direct guidance, and by his interposing power. To him it belonged, and those who occupied were to feel that they held everything at his good pleasure. What could more effectually and impressively teach this than the right which God reserved, to require them to do what he thought was best with the soil—to cultivate it or to leave it untilled? How difficult we find it to realize as we should that we hold everything as tenants at the Divine will; that we must be ready at his word to lay down that which we most regard as "our own;" that we are but "strangers and sojourners with God" (ver. 23)!

II. To INculcate MODERATION IN THE USE OF THAT WHICH THEY POSSESSED. Making haste to be rich, men too often exhaust themselves and the objects on which they work. How often is land impoverished by the incessant demand the agriculturist makes upon it! God demanded that the rich land he gave Israel should not be rendered infertile by their drawing immoderately on its virtue. He would have us use prudently, as those who look forward, the things which he puts in our power. The lesson particularly applies, in our time, to the use we make of our physical and mental powers; we should give these full measure of rest, a restorative sabbath, that they may serve us the better and the longer.

III. TO ENCOURAGE A SENSE OF BROTHERHOOD AND KINDNESS OF HEART. (Vers. 6, 7.) Of that which was spontaneously produced all might freely partake. The land was for the nation, and not merely for those whose names were enrolled as proprietors. The husbandman was to be trained to see his neighbours, whatever their condition or relation to himself, gathering the fruits of his land. This sabbatic institution said practically to him, and says to us, "God has given the earth and all it bears to the many and not to the few, to all classes of the people: cause all to rejoice in the abundance of his gifts."

IV. TO TEST THEIR MORAL AND RELIGIOUS DISPOSITION. 1. It would test their obedience. They would be under some temptation to make the ordinary use of their opportunity, and to secure a harvest by tillage. This word of the Lord tried them; the obedient regarded, the disobedient disregarded, his will. 2. It would also test their industrial virtues. Perhaps there was more room left for daily activity than some have imagined. "Each day would still present certain calls for labour in the management of household affairs, the superintendence or care of the cattle, the husbanding of the provisions laid up from preceding years, and the execution, perhaps, of improvements and repairs." Nevertheless, there must have been some temptation to abuse the long holiday. A wise man has said that nothing is so certain a criterion of character as the way in which men spend their leisure hours. The idle are tempted to vacancy or folly; the wise find an opportunity for (1) real recreation, for (2) self-improvement, for (3) service of others, for (4) the worship of God (see Deut. xxxi. 9—13).—C.

Vers. 8—55.—*Year of jubiles: I. A nation's joy.* On every fiftieth year of national life, as the sun went down on the great Day of Atonement, when the sins of the nation had been forgiven, and peace with God was once more assured, the sound of many trumpets ushered in the blessed year of jubilee. Then (1) the forfeited patrimony was restored to its rightful heir (vers. 10, 13, 28, 41); then (2) the bondsmen were free once more (vers. 10, 41—54); then (3) members of the same family, long separated, were reunited (vers. 10, 41); then (4) the ties which bound man to man throughout all classes and conditions of the nation were to be recognized and honoured (vers. 12—14, 17, 35, 36); then (5) the relation in which Israel stood to Jehovah was to be distinctly and peculiarly realized (vers. 17, 18, 23, 38, 55); and then (6) in holy joy the favoured nation was to be glad in the prosperity which came from God (ver. 19).

No nation now can expect to enjoy such an institution as this; we must learn to dispense with such miraculous arrangements as that which made the year of jubilee a possible thing to Israel (vers. 20—22). It is our national wisdom to bring about, by (1) wise and equal laws, and by (2) virtuous and godly lives, the happy estate in which the people of God found themselves when the trumpets of jubilee announced that a new era of liberty, sufficiency, piety, prosperity, had begun.

A nation may truly rejoice, and may feel that its jubilee is approaching, when it is attaining to : 1. Freedom from degrading poverty; the community not being constituted of a few wealthy men and a multitude of paupers, but being composed of those who earn an honourable livelihood by self-respectful industry, there being general, widespread prosperity. 2. The possession of liberty—individual and national, civil and religious; every cruel, degrading, injurious bond being broken, and all men being free to exercise their God-given faculties without hindrance or restraint. 3. Domestic well-being; purity, love, order in the household. 4. Piety; the recognition of indebtedness to God, and a full and deep understanding that we are, above all things, his servants. 5. Charity; a kind and generous regard to those who are “waxen poor and fallen into decay;” a ready hand to help the needy, and give them a new start in the race of life. Let a nation only be advancing in these elements of goodness and prosperity, and it may rejoice greatly in its inheritance, for then “God, even our own God, will bless it;” and though no trumpet sound the note of jubilee, then shall its “light break forth as the morning . . . and its righteousness shall go before it; and the glory of the Lord shall be its rereward” (Isa. lviii. 8).—C.

Vers. 8—55.—*Year of jubilee: II. The world's redemption.* The whole Christian era is one long year of jubilee. It is “the acceptable year of the Lord” (Luke iv. 19). That “acceptable year,” the fiftieth year in the Jewish calendar, was a year of (1) emancipation (ver. 10); (2) readjustment of social relations (vers. 10, 39—41, 43, 54); (3) national regeneration (vers. 10, 13). The land rested a second year, and recovered any virtue it may have lost, and the old patrimonies reverted to the heirs of the original owners; (4) rest from cultivation (ver. 11); (5) abounding joy.

These, in a deeper, a spiritual sense, are the characteristics of the Christian era: 1. It is a time of *spiritual emancipation*. Sin is the slavery of the soul; “men are “holden with the cords of their sins” (Prov. v. 22). They are in the bondage of selfishness, or of worldliness, or of one or other (or more than one) of the vices, or of the fear of man, or of a foolish and frivolous procrastination. To accept Jesus Christ as Saviour of the soul and Lord of the life is to be released from these spiritual fetters. 2. *Social readjustment.* Christianity, indeed, effects no immediate revolution in the forms of social life. It does not say to the slave, “Escape from thy master” (1 Cor. vii. 20); it does not give directions as to the way in which human relations are to be organized. But it *infuses a new spirit* into the minds of men; it introduces those principles of righteousness and those feelings of considerateness which silently, but most effectually, “make all things new.” It drops the seed of “charity” in the soil of human nature, and behold a goodly tree springs therefrom, the leaves of which are for the healing of the social sores of all the nations. 3. *Individual and national regeneration.* The soul that receives Jesus Christ as its Lord, and the nation that surrenders itself to his holy and beneficent rule, make an entirely new departure in their course. So great and radical is the change which is thereby effected, that the Truth himself speaks of it as a “regeneration” (John iii.). In Christ we are born again, or born from above. We enter on a new life, the life of faith, love, humility, zeal, holy service, godliness, anticipation of future blessedness. 4. *Rest of soul.* The rest of body enjoyed in the year of jubilee has its analogue in the rest of soul which we enjoy in the acceptable year of the Lord—rest from (1) a burdensome sense of condemnation; (2) self-reproach, remorse; (3) spiritual struggle and disquietude; (4) anxious, torturing fears. 5. *Joy in God.* In this “acceptable time” we have not only peace, but we also “joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ” (Rom. v. 11). We are bidden to “rejoice in the Lord alway” (Phil. iv. 4); and though there may be found in the sorrows of others as well as in our own and in the difficulties and depressions that attend us here too much of cloud and shadow to feel that it is always jubilee-time with us in our homeward journey, yet the felt presence of our Saviour, his unchanging friendship, the

blessedness of doing his work, honouring his Name, and even hearing his holy will, the view of the heavenly land,—these will “put a new song into our mouth,” a real gladness into our heart, the brightness and music of the “acceptable year” into our Christian life.—C.

Vers. 8—55.—*Year of jubilee*: III. *The blessed kingdom*. It may be thought that, while it is indeed true that the year of jubilee has a true counterpart in that dispensation of spiritual emancipation, social readjustment, regeneration, rest, joy, in which we stand; yet, on the other hand, there is so much of detraction in the sins and sorrows of the present time as to make the one but a very imperfect picture of the other. There is truth in this thought: it is only in a qualified sense that we can speak of the Christian era as a time of jubilee. Its perfect realization is yet to come; its true and glorious fulfilment awaits us, when the blessed kingdom of the Son of God shall have come in all its fulness and the latter-day glory shall appear; then there shall be—

1. *Emancipation* from all bondage. Every fetter shall be struck from the soul, as well as from the body, and we ourselves shall be free in all “the glorious liberty of the children of God.”

2. *Restitution*. We shall recover the heritage forfeited by sin; the estate which our Father intended to bestow originally on all his human children will then revert to us, and we shall “return every man unto his possession” (ver. 13). We shall know by blessed experience what God designed for holy manhood.

3. *Regeneration*. So great and blessed will be the change, the new conditions under which we shall live, that we shall feel that a “new heaven and a new earth” have been created. God will have made “all things new” to us.

4. *Reunion*. We shall “return every man unto his family” (ver. 10). Parents and children, brothers and sisters, pastor and people, long-separated friends, will gather again in the same home, and “join inseparable hands” of holy, heavenly reunion.

5. *Reign of love*. If there be gradation, inferiority, rule, and service there, all “rigour” will be unknown (ver. 46). Our “brother will live with us” (vers. 35, 36) in love; all rule will be beneficent; all service sweet and cheerful.

6. *Perfect service of the Supreme*. “Unto me the children of Israel are servants; they are my servants” (ver. 55). There is no fairer promise in the Word of God concerning the future than this—“his servants shall serve him” (Rev. xxii. 3). Then shall we attain to the ideal of our humanity when, escaping from ourselves, we shall, in thought and feeling, in word and deed, consciously and unconsciously, be serving God in stainless, uninterrupted ministry. Then God will be “all in all.”

7. *Rest and joy*. The toil and care of earth will be left behind, will be lost in the endless sabbath, and we shall “enter into rest.” Only those happy activities will await us in which we shall engage with untiring energy and unsparing joy.—C.

Vers. 1—7.—*The sabbatical year*. Rest of the land, as the physical source of blessings, as the consecrated portion of God’s people.

I. **THE NATURAL BASIS OF RELIGION.** Creation. Providence. Moral government. “Man is one world, and hath another to attend him” (George Herbert). The ascent of the higher nature from the lower. The subordination of the material and temporary to the immaterial and eternal. Care of all life involved in the covenant of God with his people. The life of the vegetable world, the life of the animal world, viewed in their relation to higher purposes of God. Art is perfected only in the atmosphere of religion. Science, both theoretic and applied, requires to be pervaded with religious spirit, or becomes atheistic, worldly, and corrupt.

II. **THE BLESSING OF GOD ON HIS PEOPLE.** “A sabbath for the Lord,” that he may rejoice with his children. 1. Material blessings promised: “All these things shall be added unto you;” “he careth for you;” “godliness hath the promise of the world which now is.” 2. Rest in the Lord, over all the land, in all states and conditions, eventually in all men. The resting land typical of the Divine promise of a restored earth and regained paradise. The weekly sabbath enlarged. Time expanding to eternity. Special opportunities granted for the larger spiritual culture.—R.

Vers. 8—34.—*The year of jubilee*. Accumulation of sabbaths and sabbatical years;

climax of rest. Proclaimed on Day of Atonement. Outcome of the original covenant. Specially soul-stirring and delightful, "waked up the nation from the very centre of its moral being." "All estates and conditions of the people were permitted to feel the hallowed and refreshing influence of this most noble institution. The exile returned; the captive was emancipated; the debtor set free; each family opened its bosom to receive once more its long-lost members; each inheritance received back its exiled owner. The sound of the trumpet was the welcome and soul-thrilling signal for the captive to escape; for the slave to cast aside the chains of his bondage; for the man-slayer to return to his home; for the ruined and poverty-stricken to rise to the possession of that which had been forfeited. No sooner had the trumpet's thrice-welcome sound fallen upon the ear than the mighty tide of blessing rose majestically, and sent its refreshing undulations into the most remote corners of Jehovah's highly favoured land." Regard it (1) socially, (2) morally, (3) spiritually.

I. **SOCIALLY.** An example of wise and beneficent legislation. As: 1. Security against accumulation of property in the hands of the few, to the oppression of the many. 2. Relief to inevitable reverses of fortune. 3. Maintenance of family life and bonds of natural affection. 4. Destruction of slavery. 5. Promotion of equality of condition and opportunity. 6. Preservation of hopefulness and cheerfulness in society. 7. Avoidance of litigation and social strife.

II. **MORALLY.** An abiding support of the higher moral sentiments. 1. Benevolence and compassion. 2. Patriotism. 3. Personal liberty. 4. Moderation. 5. Brotherhood. 6. Industry.

III. **SPiritually.** A type of realized salvation by Divine grace. 1. Proclaimed on Day of Atonement; fruit of reconciliation with God. 2. Universality of the offered deliverance, independent of human merits. 3. Promise of restored human condition—the "meek inheriting the earth." 4. The jubilee of heaven—"glorious liberty of the children of God" (Rom. viii. 21; cf. Isa. lxvi. 12—23; Luke iv. 16—22; Rev. xi. 15; xiv. 6, 7; xxi).—R.

Vers. 35—55.—*The law of personal servitude.* I. **GENERAL PRINCIPLE, love of our neighbour.** Servitude admitted in that early stage of the world, but limited and modified, and its extinction provided for in that principle of love and compassion which was seized and exalted by the gospel. God's method to subdue and extinguish effects of man's fall by the vital force of higher motive. Distinction between strangers and fellow-Israelite preserved the covenant, therefore the religion which taught love and saved the stranger.

II. **LESSON OF UNSELFISHNESS AND UNWORLDLINESS.** All servants of the Lord. All property his. The underlying facts of redemption, "bought with a price, therefore glorify God," etc.—R.

Vers. 19—21.—*The sabbatical year.* All the Divine institutions are marked by practical wisdom, and doubtless subserved many purposes which are not distinctly mentioned in the Law. To celebrate a year of abstinence from agricultural labour must have benefited the ground itself, as well as tended to produce a spirit of brotherhood amongst all classes of the people. For in that year the natural uncultivated produce of the soil was free to be partaken of by the poorest. But we shall concern ourselves chiefly with the reasons given in the Law for the observance of the sabbatical year.

J. **THE PROPRIETORSHIP OF THE LAND IS CLAIMED BY GOD.** "The land is mine" (ver. 23). As proprietors occasionally shut up a path for a day in order to prevent its being claimed as public property, so God refuses every seventh year to let the Israelites do what they please with the land, in order to remind them of the fact that he is the real owner whose grace bestowed the tenancy on them. *Men are but stewards.* God's dominion is universal over their persons and possessions. Nothing that man is or has can be exempted from the need of consecration. *The conditions of tenancy must be complied with.* If the people were unwilling to observe the terms, let them quit their holding, and start somewhere for themselves. But where shall we procure aught by our own exertions apart from the favour of the Almighty? Our very existence is due to him. Useless, then, is it to quarrel with the lease of our premises.

II. **MAN IS TAUGHT THAT HE HAS OTHER DUTIES THAN THAT OF PROVIDING FOR HIS**

**PHYSICAL WANTS.** Work is the fundamental necessity, the burden laid upon us by the declaration, "In the sweat of thy face thou shalt eat bread." Mere idleness is disgraceful. Yet by this command of the text God asserts that *rest is a duty as well as toil*. The one does indeed fit us for the other. Recreation is by no means sinful, and that is a narrow, false view which deems it so. God's rest after the work of creation has for ever hallowed legitimate relaxation. *Rest from servile labour may be properly employed in holy service.* It was during this sabbatical year that the Law was to be read in the hearing of the entire people. Man does not find his noblest end in the industrial pursuit of his daily occupation. He is not always to be surveying the same span of earth. He may lift up his head, and rejoice in upward thoughts and wider prospects. *This world is not man's final home.* So we may without violence interpret the statement, "Ye are strangers and sojourners with me." It refers primarily to the placing of Israel in a land which did not belong to them, but it conveys a deeper lesson, one of pertinent application to modern circumstances. Many fancy that if they diligently attend to their business and pay their way, they do all that can be demanded of them. Such low-thoughted action is here rebuked.

**III. TIMID FORETHOUGHT INQUIRES AS TO THE FEASIBILITY OF COMPLIANCE WITH THE ENACTMENT.** "What shall we eat the seventh year?" Man is expected to use his reason, and to anticipate the future. Ushered into the world the most helpless of animals, he is enabled to surround himself with ample might and resources. One harvest suffices to fill his granaries till they are replenished by the stores of another year. Is he to run in the teeth of prudence, and to neglect the usual tillage operations? The requirement of the Law is superior to such scruples. It may seem unreasonable conduct, unbelief may suggest terrible eventualities, but if the will of God has been clearly expressed, the devout Israelite dares not falter. *There are many Divine precepts which appear to impose trying obligations upon the faith of God's people.* Some have feared to risk the loss involved in renouncing Sunday trading. Some have refused to sacrifice any portion of their time or profits to engage in religious work. The livelihood of themselves and families has been the one prominent object. Too often the necessary provision is rated too high, and luxuries are included among the essentials. There are others to whom the question suggests itself, "How can I compete with my rivals if I adhere to moral laws and discountenance all practices savouring of dishonesty? To make a profession of Christianity may entail the loss of position and worldly esteem."

**IV. GOD PROMISES THAT NOTHING SHALL BE LOST THROUGH OBEDIENCE TO HIS STATUTES.** "I will command my blessing upon you." The sixth year shall bring forth fruit for three years. Of course, this supposes a supernatural association of conduct and prosperity which is not to be looked for in the ordinary course of providence. Yet the *promise of blessing upon the faithful is for every generation.* There is a full recompence guaranteed for all tribulation endured in the service of righteousness. Nor are the instances few in number where men have in modern times experienced the truth of the assertion that God withdraws no good thing from them that walk uprightly, that the righteous are not forsaken, nor have their poor been obliged to beg for bread. Recently a Greek newspaper owned that since it had discontinued its Sunday issue, its profits had increased rather than diminished. This, at least, is certain, that he makes a good investment who takes shares in God's companies formed for righteous purposes. Such shall realize the double assurance of "safety" and "abundance" (ver. 19). Note our Lord's reply to Peter asking, "What shall we have then?" Moses esteemed "the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt." *Let the promises of God's Word scatter all doubt and hesitation!* His counsel may appear strange as it did to King Zedekiah (Jer. xxxviii. 20), but the result shall verify his wisdom. "What shall it profit a man, if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" In keeping his commandments there is great reward. It is good for this life, and even better for the life to come.—S. R. A.

**Ver. 42.—Servants of God.** The Law contains other than ceremonial regulations. Many of its precepts are moral in the highest degree, and breathe the spirit of purest Christianity. Indeed, the Christian Church, with the relationship of its members, its benefits, and obligations, is clearly outlined in the nation of Israel; rather, however, sad

to say, in its constitution than in actual observance of its conditions. Little alteration is needed to suit the injunctions of this passage to modern circumstances.

I. GOD'S SERVANTS ARE SO BY VIRTUE OF WHAT HE HAS DONE FOR THEM. "They are my servants which I brought forth out of the land of Egypt." Redemption from the iron furnace of affliction was the ground on which Jehovah continually claimed the Israelites as his own peculiar property. "I have broken the bonds of your yoke." So God gave his Son as the price of man's ransom from sin, and Christ is said to have purchased the Church of God with his own blood. Paul delighted to call himself a "bondservant" of Christ in the superscription of his Epistles. To the goodness of God the Israelites owed their preservation and their installation in a goodly land. *Gratitude constrains to faithful service.* We have but to review the past to notice numberless golden bands that attach us to the Redeemer. The matchless character of our God furnishes sufficient reason for executing his commands, but this character is best evidenced by a survey of the deeds of sovereign love that have made us what we are and placed us where we are.

II. GOD'S SERVICE PRECLUDES OUR BEING IN BONDAGE. We cannot serve two masters, and if we belong to God, others cannot claim absolute lordship over us. "They shall not be sold as bondmen," for this would signify that God's ownership is disputed. Only the foreigner can be treated as a slave without insulting Jehovah. *Slavery is thus really condemned*, though permitted with restrictions. The Law must not be too far in advance of the morality of those who are to keep it, lest it overshoot the mark and prove powerless to guide and instruct. What was granted in earliest ages may be altogether unpardonable in days of modern illumination and progress. We shall be judged according to the light we have to direct our steps. *The truth shines clearly forth that to serve God is truest freedom.* It accords with the noblest dictates of our nature; reason and conscience glorify such obedience. Like the railway train, we fulfil our highest functions, not by deserting but by running upon the lines laid down for our advance. See the warnings addressed to Christians by Jesus Christ (Matt. viii. 34), Paul (Rom. vi. 16), and Peter (2 Pet. ii. 19). When we are actuated by the suggestions of the tempter, we rebel against God's authority and proclaim ourselves unworthy servants. And to seek to ensnare others or to induce them to act contrary to Divine instructions, is even worse than to have been brought into bondage ourselves. God will not brook these infractions of his majesty.

III. THE SERVANTS OF GOD ARE BOUND TO AVOID ALL HARSH TREATMENT OF ONE ANOTHER. Unjust dealing is reprobated. Bad in any case, it is peculiarly offensive here. The people of God are not to forget that they are brethren in the employment of the one master. "If that evil servant shall say in his heart, My Lord delayeth his coming, and shall begin to smite his fellow-servants, the lord of that servant shall come in a day when he looketh not for him," is the New Testament version of the command, "Thou shalt not rule over him with rigour; but shalt fear thy God" (ver. 43). Christian brotherhood is not intended to upset the constitution of a society in a fruitless endeavour after social equalization. Distinction of rank and class is recognized by the Apostle Paul, and proper regard must be paid to those in authority. The servant is not to despise his master because the latter is a brother in Christ; on the other hand, the masters are to forbear threatening, "knowing that both their Master and yours is in heaven" (Eph. vi. 9). It cannot be pleasing to Christ to see an unfair advantage taken of a brother Christian's hour of weakness. Such conduct virtually dishonours the Master whom we profess to serve, it offends "one of these little ones." And further, *fellow-servants should relieve each other's wants* (see ver. 35, and margin, "strengthen"). There is a "bond" of union between them, and love and regard for the Master must lead them to see that in giving to the poor they are lending unto the Lord. "One is your Master" (Instructor), "and all ye are brethren." To collect for the Church poor at the observance of the Lord's Supper is a happy recognition of this truth. Many are the vicissitudes of life that beset the most honest and industrious. Changes of fortune merit our sympathy, and the cloud is beautified with rainbow hues when the sun of brotherly love shines athwart its darkness. Another's fate may at any time become our own. How it will mitigate our grief to know that in our season of elevation and prosperity we were not unmindful of the woes of others! "Blessed is he that considereth the poor: the Lord will deliver him in the time of trouble." "As we have opportunity, let us do good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith."—S. R. A.

## PART V.

## CONCLUDING EXHORTATION.

## EXPOSITION.

## CHAPTER XXVI.

THE first two verses of this chapter contain a prohibition of idolatry, and a command to observe the sabbath and to reverence God's sanctuary; that is, they repeat in summary the substance of the Israelites, religious duty, negative and positive, as comprised in the first table of the Decalogue. They form, therefore, a prologue to the remainder of the chapter, which solemnly announces: 1. The blessings which should result from obedience (vers. 8—18). 2. The curses which should follow disobedience (vers. 14—39). 3. The gracious treatment which would ensue on repentance (vers. 40—45).

Hitherto the Book of Leviticus has consisted of ceremonial and moral injunctions, with two historical passages interposed. In the present chapter it rises in its subject and its diction from legal precepts and a legal style to prediction and the style which became a prophet. We may trace in Joel (ii. 22—27) an intimate acquaintance on the part of the earliest prophet of Judah with this chapter. The first promise there, as here, is that of rain, and as here it is to be "*in due season*," so there it is "*the former and the latter rain*," that is, the regular autumn and spring rains. "*The land shall yield her increase, and the trees of the field shall yield their fruit*," appears in the prophet as, "*the pastures of the wilderness do spring, for the tree beareth her fruit, the fig tree and the vine do yield their strength*." The following clause, "*your threshing shall reach unto the vintage, and the vintage shall reach unto the sowing time*," as, "*the floors shall be full of wheat, and the fats shall overflow with wine and oil*;" the next clause, "*ye shall eat your bread to the full, and dwell in your land safely*," as, "*I will send you corn, and wine,*

*and oil, and ye shall be satisfied therewith*," and "*ye shall eat in plenty, and be satisfied*;" the clause, "*I will give peace in the land, and ye shall lie down, and none shall make you afraid*," as "*I will no more make you a reproach among the heathen*," and "*my people shall never be ashamed*;" and the clause, "*I will rid evil creatures [not beasts] out of the land, neither shall the sword go through your land*," as, "*I will remove far off from you the northern*," and "*I will restore to you the years that the locust hath eaten, the canker-worm, and the caterpillar, and the palmer-worm, my great army which I sent among you*."

The blessings and the curses rise one above the other in regular gradation: on the one side, rain, abundance, peace, deliverance, victory, increase in numbers, communion with God; on the other side, (1) horror, wasting, and the burning fever, hostile spoiling of the fields, defeat, and causeless flight; (2) the heaven iron, and the earth brass, failure of crops and fruits in spite of labour spent upon them; (3) wild beasts for the destruction of cattle, children, and men, desolation of the highways; (4) the sword, pestilence, and famine; (5) cannibalism, overthrow of their heathen idols and of God's own house and worship, destruction of their cities, utter desolation of their lands, and their captivity among the heathen. And even yet the full measure of their misery is not accomplished, for while the land enjoys her sabbaths, the captives, if unrepentant, are to fall from one misery to another, till they pine away and are consumed. Each of these grades is described as being symbolically seven times worse, that is, incomparably worse, than that which has gone before. Because these plagues would come, and in fact did come, upon them as the immediate result of physical or moral

causes that could be traced, they are none the less the effect of God's wrath upon his apostate people.

Confession of sin, recognition of God's providence in all that had happened to them, humility, and acquiescence in their punishment, would restore them to their forfeited covenant relation (vers. 40—45). Then God would “*not abhor them to destroy them utterly*,” but would “*remember the covenant of their fathers*.” Thus it was that God brought them back after the Babylonish Captivity; and thus it is that, upon their repentance, he replaces in a state of salvation Churches and individuals that have fallen away from him. In this way punishments become a blessing, and men are able to “*accept of them*,” or *rejoice in them*, as the word might be rendered.

Ver. 1.—*Ye shall make you no idols nor graven image, neither rear you up a standing image, neither shall ye set up any image of stone in your land, to bow down unto it.* The word *idols* (*elilm*) means the “nothings” which the heathen substituted for the Lord God. The *graven image* (here meaning a carved wooden image), the *standing image* (meaning a sacred pillar), and the *image of stone* (that is, a sculptured stone idol), are the three forms of images under which adoration was paid, whether to the true God or to a false deity. The expression, *to bow down unto* (or *towards*) *it*, forbids worshipping before an image as well as worshipping an image.

Ver. 2.—*Ye shall keep my sabbaths, and reverence my sanctuary: I am the Lord.* These words are repeated textually from ch. xix. 30.

Ver. 3.—*If ye walk in my statutes.* The free will of man is recognized equally with God's controlling power.

Vers. 4—6.—These verses appear to have been in the mind, not of Joel only, as already pointed out, but of Ezekiel (xxxiv. 20—31). In Leviticus we find, *Then I will give you rain in due season; in Ezekiel, “And I will cause the shower to come down in his season; there shall be showers of blessing.”* In Leviticus, *And the land shall yield her increase, and the trees of the field shall yield their fruit;* in Ezekiel, “*And the tree of the field shall yield her fruit, and the earth her increase.*” In Leviticus, *Ye shall dwell in your land safely;* in Ezekiel, “*They shall dwell safely in the wilderness, and sleep in the woods.*” In Leviticus, *And I will give peace in the land, and ye shall lie down, and none shall make you afraid:* and I will rid evil beasts out of the land, neither shall the sword go through your land; in Ezekiel,

“*And I will make with them a covenant of peace, and will cause the evil beasts to cease out of the land. . . . And they shall no more be a prey to the heathen, neither shall the beast of the land devour them; but they shall dwell safely, and none shall make them afraid.*” The promise, *Your threshing shall reach unto the vintage, and the vintage shall reach unto the sowing time,* is similar to that in the prophet Amos, “*Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that the plowman shall overtake the reaper, and the treader of grapes him that soweth seed*” (ix. 13).

Ver. 8.—*And five of you shall chase an hundred.* Cf. Josh. xxiii. 10, “*One man of you shall chase a thousand.*” For examples, see Judg. iii. 31; xv. 15; 1 Sam. xiv. 6—16; 2 Sam. xxiii. 8.

Ver. 10.—*Ye shall eat old store, and bring forth the old because of the new.* The provisions of the past year would be so abundant that they would have to be removed to make place for the new stores.

Ver. 11.—*And I will set my tabernacle among you.* This was fulfilled, spiritually, as shown to St. John in his vision of the new Jerusalem: “*I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God*” (Rev. xxi. 3). *And my soul shall not abhor you.* The result of God's abhorrence being his rejection of those whom he abhors (see ch. xx. 23).

Ver. 12.—*And I will walk among you, and will be your God, and ye shall be my people.* These words are quoted by St. Paul as a ground of the holiness required of God's people (2 Cor. vi. 16).

Ver. 13.—*And I have broken the bands of your yoke.* This expression, used also in the parallel passage of Ezekiel above referred to (xxxiv. 27), and Jer. xvii. 2 receives an illustration from the ancient method of harnessing oxen, still kept up in the East and South. *The band* means the straight piece of wood laid across the necks of the oxen, by which their heads are fastened together to keep them level with each other, and by which they are attached to the pole of the waggon. The single collars worn by horses in more northern countries have not the same oppressive effect.

Vers. 14—17.—Punishment in its first degree. *Terror, consumption,—that is, wasting—and the burning ague, that shall consume the eyes, and cause sorrow of heart:*—a proverbial expression for great distress (see 1 Sam. ii. 33)—*and ye shall sow your seed in vain, for your enemies shall eat it* (see Jer. v. 17, and Micah vi. 15, “*Thou shalt sow, but thou shalt not reap; thou shalt*

tread the olives, but thou shalt not anoint thee with oil") . . . and ye shall be slain before your enemies (as took place often in their after history, see Judg. ii. 14; iii. 8; iv. 2); they that hate you shall reign—that is, rule—over you; and ye shall flee when none pursueth you.

Vera. 18—20.—Punishment in its second degree. I will make your heaven as iron, and your earth as brass; the result of no rain in a land scorched by the fiery Eastern sun. Your land shall not yield her increase, neither shall the trees of the land yield their fruits. Cf. 1 Kings viii. 35; Hag. i. 10, 11.

Vera. 21, 22.—Punishment in its third degree. I will also send wild beasts among you, which shall rob you of your children, and destroy your cattle, and make you few in number. So in the case of the Assyrians transported to Palestine, "At the beginning of their dwelling there, they feared not the Lord: therefore the Lord sent lions among them, which slew some of them" (2 Kings xvii. 25)—and your high ways shall be desolate. Cf. Judg. v. 6, "In the days of Shamgar the son of Anath, in the days of Jael, the highways were unoccupied, and the travellers walked through byways."

Vera. 23—26.—Punishment in its fourth degree. I will bring a sword upon you, that shall avenge the quarrel of my covenant: . . . I will send the pestilence among you; and ye shall be delivered into the hand of the enemy—that is, ye shall go into captivity . . . and ye shall eat, and not be satisfied. Cf. Ezek. v. 12, "A third part of thee shall die with pestilence, and with famine shall they be consumed in the midst of thee: and a third part shall fall by the sword round about thee; and I will scatter a third part into all the winds, and I will draw out a sword after them." The famine that is to come upon them is described as making ten women bake bread in one oven,—whereas in ordinary times one oven was only sufficient for one woman's baking—and they shall deliver you your bread again by weight; that is, the quantity baked will have to be weighed out in rations, before any one is allowed to take it. See 2 Kings vi. 25; Isa. iii. 1; Jer. xiv. 18; and as illustrative of the last point, Ezek. iv. 16, "Behold, I will break the staff of bread in Jerusalem: and they shall eat bread by weight, and with care; and they shall drink water by measure, and with astonishment."

Vera. 27—33.—Punishment in the fifth degree. Ye shall eat the flesh of your sons, and the flesh of your daughters shall ye eat. We find that this threat was fulfilled in Samaria (2 Kings vi. 28), and in Jerusalem at the time both of the earlier siege by the Chaldeans, and of the later siege by the

Romans (see Lam. ii. 20; iv. 10; Josephus, 'Bell. Jud.', v. 9, 3; and the terrible case of Mary daughter of Eleazar, Josephus, 'Bell. Jud.', vi. 3, 4). And I will destroy your high places. By *high places* is meant the tops of hills or eminences chosen for worship, whether of Jehovah (see Judg. vi. 26; 1 Kings iii. 2; 2 Kings xii. 3; 1 Chron. xxi. 26), or of false gods. The high places intended here are the spots where the "sun-images" were erected (see 2 Chron. xiv. 5; Isa. xvii. 8; Ezek. vi. 4)—and cut down your images, and cast your carcases upon the carcases of your idols—that is, they should roll in the dust together. And I will make your cities waste—as Samaria and Jerusalem—and bring your sanctuaries unto desolation,—by the *sanctuaries*, which are to be desolated, is meant all the consecrated things: the holy of holies, the holy place, the court, the ark, the altar of incense, the altar of burnt sacrifice—and I will not smell the savour of your sweet odours—so in Jer. vi. 20, "To what purpose cometh there to me incense from Sheba, and the sweet cane from a far country? your burnt offerings are not acceptable, nor your sacrifices sweet" (cf. Isa. i. 11—15). And I will bring the land into desolation (cf. Jer. ix. 11): and your enemies which dwell therein shall be astonished at it (cf. Ezek. v. 15). And I will scatter you among the heathen, and will draw out a sword after you. See Jer. ix. 16, "I will scatter them also among the heathen, whom neither they nor their fathers have known: and I will send a sword after them, till I have consumed them."

Vers. 34, 35.—The land had not participated in the sins of its inhabitants. The latter had thought that, by the neglect of the sabbatical years, they had enriched themselves by the fruits of those years which would otherwise have been wasted. The result was that they lost the land altogether for a period equal to that during which it ought to have kept sabbath, and the land "as long as she lay desolate kept sabbath, to fulfil threescore and ten years" (2 Chron. xxxvi. 21). From the entrance into the holy land until the Babylonish Captivity there elapsed eight hundred and sixty-three years, in which time there ought to have been kept one hundred and twenty-three sabbatical years. As only seventy are made up by the duration of the Captivity, it may be concluded that fifty-three sabbatical years were observed by the Israelites; but this conclusion is very doubtful. It is more likely that seventy, being a multiple of the sacred number seven, was regarded as sufficient to purge all previous neglects, whatever they might have been.

Vera. 36—39.—The final punishment.

Upon them that are left, that is, the surviving captives and exiles, I will send a faintness into their hearts,—so Ezek. xxi. 7, “And every heart shall melt, and all hands shall be feeble, and every spirit shall faint, and all knees shall be weak as water”—... and the sound of a shaken (or driven) leaf shall chase them; . . . and they shall fall, . . . and ye shall perish among the heathen, and the land of your enemies shall eat you up. And they that are left of you shall pine away in their iniquity in your enemies’ lands. This is the concluding threat. It is conditional in its nature, and the condition having been fulfilled, we may say with reverence that it has been accomplished. Those of the ten tribes who did not find their way to Babylon, and so became absorbed in the body which returned to Jerusalem, have been *eaten up by the land of their enemies*, and have *pied away in their enemies’ lands*. Neither they nor their descendants are to be found in any part of the globe, however much investigation may employ itself in searching for them. They have been absorbed by the populations among which they were scattered.

Vers. 40—45.—God’s pardon will, even yet, as always, follow upon confession of sin

and genuine repentance. They must recognize not only that they have sinned, but that their sufferings have been a punishment for those sins at God’s hand. This will work in them humble acquiescence in God’s doings, and then he will remember his covenant with Jacob, and also his covenant with Isaac, and also his covenant with Abraham, and for the sake of the covenant of their ancestors, he will not cast them away, neither will he abhor them, to destroy them utterly, and to break his covenant with them. Whether Jewish repentance has been or ever will be so full as to obtain this blessing, cannot be decided now. Perhaps it may be the case that all the blessings promised by Moses and by future prophets to repentant and restored Israel are to find their accomplishment in the spiritual Israel, the children of Abraham who is “the father of all them that believe” (Rom. iv. 11), seeing that “God is able of stones to raise up children unto Abraham” (Matt. iii. 9).

Ver. 46.—This is the closing paragraph of the Book of Leviticus; to which another chapter has been added, in the form of an appendix, on the subject of *vows*.

#### HOMILETICS.

Vers. 3—46.—*Promises and threatenings.* In this chapter the prophet looks forward, and declares how God would deal with his people; which should be according to the way in which they should act. In 2 Chron. xxxvi. 14—21, the chronicler looks back, and shows how God had dealt with them; which had been according to the way in which they had acted.

The promises and the threatenings are to the nation, not to individuals; and the prophetic assurance is that national obedience to God shall bring about national happiness and prosperity, and that disobedience shall cause the ruin of the nation. In spite of the rough, wild times of the Judges, and of the apostacy of Saul, the heart of the nation was on the whole loyal to Jehovah till the end of the days of Solomon. And till that time there was an upward growth in the flourishing estate of the people—their wealth, their power, their prosperity, their happiness. In the latter days of Solomon, outwardly glorious as they were, decay and corruption began. King and people were alike affected by the splendid despotism which one wielded and under which the other flourished in material prosperity. In that prosperity they forgot the source of it. The king himself pushed his tolerance for foreign habits into idolatry, “His wives turned away his heart after other gods: and his heart was not perfect with the Lord his God, as was the heart of David his father. . . . And the Lord was angry with Solomon, because his heart was turned from the Lord God of Israel” (1 Kings xi. 4—9). Like prince, like people; a general relaxation of moral fibre and religious zeal ensued throughout the kingdom. Its culminating point had been reached, and now there followed the rapid descent and fall which resulted from disobedience. The first step to ruin was the great schism, from the effects of which neither the northern nor the southern kingdom ever recovered. Then followed the various apostacies and punishments. In the southern kingdom, “Rehoboam forsook the Law of the Lord, and all Israel with him. And it came to pass, that in the fifth year of King Rehoboam, Shishak King of Egypt came up against Jerusalem, because they had transgressed against the Lord” (2 Chron. xii. 1, 2). Jehoram “walked in the way of the kings of Israel, like as did the house of

Ahab (for he had the daughter of Ahab to wife): and he wrought that which was evil in the eyes of the Lord. . . . In his days the Edomites revolted. . . . Moreover the Lord stirred up against Jehoram the spirit of the Philistines, and of the Arabians, that were near the Ethiopians: and they came up into Judah, and brake into it" (2 Chron. xxi. 6—17). In the latter days of Joash, "they left the house of the Lord God of their fathers, and served groves and idols: and wrath came upon Judah and Jerusalem for this their trespass. . . . And it came to pass at the end of the year, that the host of Syria came up . . . with a small company of men, and the Lord delivered a very great host into their hand, because they had forsaken the Lord God of their fathers" (2 Chron. xxiv. 18—24). In the reign of Amaziah, Jerusalem was taken by Joash King of Israel, because "Amaziah sought after the gods of Edom" (2 Chron. xxv. 14—24). Ahaz "made molten images for Baalim. . . . Wherefore the Lord his God delivered him into the hand of the King of Syria . . . and into the hand of the King of Israel" (2 Chron. xxviii. 2—5). At the beginning of the reign of Manasseh, "the Lord spake to Manasseh, and to his people: but they would not hearken. Wherefore the Lord brought upon them the captains of the host of the King of Assyria" (2 Chron. xxxiii. 10, 11). And at last, these partial chastisements having failed to bring about reformation, came the Babylonian Captivity. "The Lord God of their fathers sent to them by his messengers, rising up betimes, and sending; because he had compassion on his people, and on his dwelling place: but they mocked the messengers of God, and despised his words, and misused his prophets, until the wrath of the Lord arose against his people, till there was no remedy. Therefore he brought upon them the King of the Chaldees, who slew their young men with the sword in the house of their sanctuary, and had no compassion upon young man or maiden, old man, or him that stooped for age: he gave them all into his hand. . . . And them that had escaped from the sword carried he away to Babylon" (2 Chron. xxxvi. 15—20).

The transgressions of the northern kingdom were even greater than those of the southern kingdom, and their final punishment, therefore, fell upon them earlier. "For so it was, that the children of Israel had sinned against the Lord their God, . . . and walked in the statutes of the heathen, . . . for they served idols, whereof the Lord had said unto them, Ye shall not do this thing. . . . And they rejected his statutes, and his covenant that he made with their fathers. . . . Therefore the Lord was very angry, . . . and removed them out of his sight" (2 Kings xvii. 7—18). This occurred in the reign of Hoshea, and in the case of the ten tribes we find no symptoms of repentance under suffering. The two tribes produced a Daniel; and his prayer for the forgiveness of his people (Dan. ix. 3—19) illustrates the feelings of the better of his fellow-captives; and therefore, according to the promise of ch. xxvi. 40—42, God remembered his covenant with Jacob, and Isaac, and Abraham, and raised up Zerubbabel, Ezra, and Nehemiah to effect the restoration; while the ten tribes pined away in the land of their captivity. Thus Moses' prediction was fulfilled.

God deals with other nations as with Israel; but we have not the inspired record of his dealings. While Greece cultivated intellectual wisdom, she flourished; when she turned to sophistry, she perished. While Rome spread order and law throughout the globe, she grew in strength; when she submitted to the sway of arbitrary despots, she fell. What is England's mission in the world? To disseminate at once true religion and true liberty. As long as she does this, she will receive God's blessing. As soon as she fails to fulfil the purpose of her existence as a nation, she will be withdrawn from the scene, and another instrument raised up in her stead.

#### HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

*Temporal rewards and punishments.* Ch. xxvi.; cf. Eccles. viii. 11; Isa. xlvi. 18; Matt. v. 44, 45; and 1 Tim. iv. 8. There is in this chapter a distinct assertion of moral government exercised over Israel. If they obeyed God's Law, he would grant them great temporal blessing; if they disobeyed, he would send them sore chastisement; but if after disobedience they became penitent, he would remember their fathers and his covenant with them, and receive their penitent seed into favour again. The whole

question, consequently, of the “method of the Divine government” is hereby raised. And here let us remark—

I. GOD'S JUDGMENTS, WHETHER REWARDS OR PUNISHMENTS, WERE EXECUTED WITH BECOMING LEISURE AND DELIBERATION. It is along the lines of natural law, as distinguished from miracle, that he proposes to execute his decisions. If the people prove obedient, then they are to have (1) bountiful harvests; (2) national triumph and consequent peace; (3) riddance of the beasts of the field, so far as they would injure their crops; (4) great increase of the population; and (5) the enjoyment of religious ordinances. On the other hand, if the people prove disobedient, they are to have (1) sickness; (2) scarcity; (3) defeat; (4) devastation by wild beasts; (5) famine in its most fearful forms; and (6) a sabbatic desolation in the Lord's land.

Now, it is to the leisurely and deliberate element in the rewards and the punishments that we direct attention. If God chose to execute his sentences speedily, if obedience got its reward immediately, if disobedience got its punishment without one moment's delay,—then men would have no room for question, and no room for moral education and decision. Such a childish regulation would doubtless prevent a large amount of evil in the world, but it would keep men children always. It is a pitiable stage of education when the child insists on seeing its reward before it obeys, and requires the immediate “slap” to prevent disobedience. If men are to be trained morally, they must be asked to *take upon credit* God's promises and threatenings, and decide in the interval before he is pleased to act.

This leaves room for a large amount of evil. “Because sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily, therefore the heart of the sons of men is fully set in them to do evil” (Eccles. viii. 11). Men may say, because God does not show quickly his hand, that he may possibly not show it at all. Hence they sin and say, “The Lord shall not see, neither shall the God of Jacob regard it” (Ps. xciv. 7). The Lord's delay is interpreted as Divine indifference. This is one of the evils due to man's sinful heart exercising its freedom under a truly paternal government. Instead of God's goodness in the delay leading men to repentance, it is allowed to foster a hope that he will resign the reins of government altogether and sit indifferently by, while men do as they please. An instance of this tendency to misinterpretation is afforded by Professor Tyndall, in his ‘Fragments of Science,’ where he has the audacity to deduce from Matt. v. 45, “He maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust,” as the doctrine of the Master himself, that “the distribution of natural phenomena is not affected by moral or religious causes;”<sup>1</sup> whereas the context shows that the whole arrangement is prompted by love towards his enemies, that they may be induced to become his friends. Men get easily warped in their interpretations, and miss the point, or want to miss it.

On the other hand, God's delay in making good his promises and threatenings affords an opportunity for humiliation and faith. When men believe he will be as good and as severe as he says, then they humble themselves under his mighty hand, and supplicate his forgiveness. When also, as his forgiven ones, they try to the best of their ability to obey him, then the delay of the promised blessing enables them to cultivate the “patience of hope,” and thus to complete their character. If, therefore, there are drawbacks through man's sin on the one side, there are vast advantages to human character on the other attending this arrangement.

II. GOD'S JUDGMENTS, EVEN WHEN EXECUTED, HAVE NOT THE AIR OF FINALITY ABOUT THEM. Notwithstanding the special pleading of Warburton and his followers about the temporal character of the Divine judgments among the Jews, and their consequent ignorance about a future life,<sup>2</sup> it is evident on the face of the judgments that they are not final. Little children perishing and eaten in the sieges (ver. 29) could not be regarded surely as a final judgment. Children suffering for their parents' sins could not be regarded as a final judgment. In truth, God's judgments among the Jews, like his judgments still, were imperfect, and designedly so. “For observe,” says the Rev. Charles Wolfe, “if we found every man in this life received just what he deserved, and every evil work always brought swift punishment along with it, what should we naturally conclude? There is no future punishment in store. I see nothing

<sup>1</sup> Page 36 of 3rd edit.

<sup>2</sup> ‘Divine Legation of Moses,’ bk. v.

wanting; every man has already received the due reward of his works; everything is already complete, and, therefore, there is nothing to be done in the next world. Or if, on the other hand, there were no punishment visited upon sin at all in this world, we might be inclined to say, Tush, God hath forgotten; he never interferes amongst us; we have no proof of his hatred of sin, or of his determination to punish it; he is gone away far from us, and has left us to follow our own wills and imaginations. So that if sentences were either *perfectly* executed on earth, or *not executed at all*, we might have some reason for saying that there was a *chance* of none in a future world. But now it is *imperfectly* executed; just *so much done* as to say, 'You are watched; my eye is upon you; I neither slumber nor sleep; and my vengeance slumbereth not.' And yet, at the same time, there is *so little done*, that a man has to look into eternity for the accomplishment."<sup>1</sup>

III. GOD'S PROMISE TO THE PENITENT IMPLIES THAT THEY ARE NOT PARDONED SIMPLY ON THE GROUND OF THEIR PENITENCE. The Lord contemplates the Jewish defection as practically certain. At the same time, he holds out the hope of the penitent people being restored to favour (vers. 40—46). But it is surely significant that penitence is expressly shown not to be the *ground* of acceptance. Doubtless it is the *condition*; but were it the sole ground of acceptance, as it is confidently asserted to be,<sup>2</sup> it is not easy to see why in such a case as that now before us God would speak about remembering their fathers, and throwing the radiance, so to speak, of their obedience round about their children (vers. 42, 45). It is evident the penitents, even after they have been punished, cannot stand alone. And in truth, when the whole matter of acceptance is analyzed, it is seen to rest upon a *covenant of sacrifice*. The sacrifices of the covenant, as we have already seen, point unmistakably to a suffering Substitute, the glory of whose merits must encircle all accepted ones. In word, we are led straight to Jesus, the Lamb of God, by whose blood we are redeemed and received into covenant relations. "Accepted in the Beloved," we are careful to "abstain from the very appearance of evil," and in the exercise of new obedience we find a triumphant power bestowed. When we hearken to his commandments our peace flows like a river, and our righteousness becomes resistless like the waves of the sea (Isa. xlvi. 18). We find that "godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come" (1 Tim. iv. 8).—R. M. E.

Vers. 1—13.—*The blessedness of the righteous.* In the words before us we have—

I. THE QUALITIES OF THE RIGHTEOUS DESCRIBED. These are: 1. *That they worship the true God.* (1) They make no idols. Graven images. Pillars to memorialize advantages supposed to be derived from false gods. Witness the votive offerings of the papists. They might not superstitiously worship such stones of memorial as Jacob set up to memorialize the blessings of Jehovah (see Gen. xxviii. 18; and comp. 2 Kings xviii. 4). The images of stone or "stones of picture" (see margin) would probably be statues. Note: men *make* their idols. (2) They respect Jehovah. He is the Maker of all things. He is himself uncreate. He is the Covenant Friend of the righteous. 2. *That they worship him truly.* (1) By keeping his sabbaths. *Memorials* of his works of creation and redemption. *Pledges* of the rest of heaven. (2) These are: weekly—monthly—yearly—septennial—in the jubilee. (3) By reverencing his sanctuary. The place of his presence, of his altar, of the congregation of his people. 3. *They serve him obediently.* (1) Walking in his statutes. This implies the study of his Word. (2) To keep his commandments also implies prayer for Divine grace.

II. THEIR BLESSEDNESS ASSURED. They have the promise of: 1. *Plenty.* (1) The elements were to be propitious to them. Seasonable rains. These are very important. They are here mentioned as representing all benign elemental influences—light, heat, electricity,—all which are essential. (2) The result then is abundance (ver. 5). Before they could have reaped and threshed out their *corn*, the *vintage* should be ready, and before they could have pressed out their wine, it would be time again to sow. (3) This was to prefigure the abundance of grace which should mark the times of the gospel (see Amos ix. 18). 2. *Security.* (1) From the hostility of the *elements*. No plague should invade them. (2) From the hostility of *men*. No warrior should invade them.

<sup>1</sup> Wolfe's 'Remains,' 6th edit., pp. 325, 326.  
LEVITICUS.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Hutton's 'Essays,' vol. i. p. 372.  
2 E

No robber should trouble them. (3) From the hostility of *animals*. Where population is reduced by wars and famines, beasts of prey prowl. (4) How the faithfulness of God has been verified in the history of his people! 3. *Victory*. (1) God puts the dread of them into their enemies. They fly before them. Witness the flight of the Syrians in the days of Elisha (2 Kings vii.). (2) He puts courage into their hearts. Witness the exploits of Gideon, of Samson, of Jonathan and his armour-bearer (1 Sam. xiv. 6, 12). 4. *Multiplication*. (1) This is a blessing of the covenant. It is a real strength to a nation. It is a real strength to a Church. (2) But outside the covenant mere numbers may prove a formidable evil. 5. *Divine favour*. (1) "I will have respect unto you." Contrast with this Heb. x. 38. (2) The token of the favour of God is his presence. (a) His tabernacle was amongst them in the wilderness. What miracles of mercy were shown to them then! (b) How glorious were the days of Solomon when the Shechinah entered the temple! (c) His tabernacle was set among his people in the presence of Jesus (John i. 14). But they did not know the blessedness of their day. (d) How blessed is the mystical incarnation of Christ in the believer! (John vi. 56; 2 Cor. vi. 16—18; vii. 1). (e) The glory of the tabernacle will culminate in the new heavens and earth (see Rev. xxi. 3).

All this blessedness was pledged in the emancipation from the bondage of Egypt (ver. 13). More fully in the redemption of the gospel typified thereby.—J. A. M.

Vers. 14—39.—*Prophetic maledictions*. The promises of God are prophecies of good; so are his threatening prophecies of evil. Prophecy, therefore, gives no countenance to fatalism, since it is made to depend upon conditions. God may, therefore, repent him of evils threatened, viz. when sinners repent of the sin that provoked him. So long as the Hebrews were faithful to their God, they found him faithful in mercy; when they rebelled, they found him no less faithful in judgment. What a commentary upon the verses before us is the history of the Israelites! Let us review—

I. **THE JUDGMENTS DENOUNCED AGAINST THEM IN THEIR LAND.** For their rebellion: 1. *They were to be visited with plagues*. (1) The plague of *terror*. This is the natural plague of a guilty conscience. The apprehension of formidable judgments. (2) *Of consumption*. This term expresses all chronic diseases. (3) *Of burning ague*. This describes those diseases which are more acute. (4) All these plagues are to "consume the eyes, and cause sorrow of heart." 2. *They were to suffer from invasion*. (1) The sword of the enemy was to consume them. How fearfully they suffered under the judges, under the kings, and afterwards! (2) The exactions of the tyrant were to distress them. When the invaders mastered them, how grievously were they oppressed! 3. *They were to encounter the anger of their God*. (1) The plague and the sword of the enemy could not otherwise have visited them. (2) But in the source itself there is the most formidable terror. "I will set my face against you." 4. *Their obstinacy was to bring upon them aggravated evils*. (1) The land was to become unfruitful. For the heaven was to be like iron, which might reflect the glare of heat, but could distil no rain or dew. (2) Wild beasts were to come among them. When the people become diminished by war and pestilence and famine, wild animals multiply and become formidable (see Numb. xxi. 6; 2 Kings xvii. 25; ii. 24; Ezek. v. 17). (3) It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God. Rather let us seek his mercy.

II. **THOSE DENOUNCED AGAINST THEM IN THE LANDS OF THEIR CAPTIVITY.** 1. *They were to be scattered amongst the heathen* (ver. 33). (1) Thus ten of the tribes were carried away by the Assyrians. (2) The two remaining tribes were afterwards removed by the Babylonians. (3) Some of these returned under Ezra and Nehemiah, and were ultimately carried away by the Romans. 2. *The sword was to follow them there*. (1) The sword of war. (2) The sword of persecution. So they suffered from pagans, from papists, from Mohammedans. 3. *They were to suffer astonishment* (vers. 36—39). (1) Faintness of heart, suspicion of danger where it existed not, susceptibility to panic. (2) Pining in terror. (3) Perishing through the rapacity of their enemies. 4. *Their sufferings were to be protracted*. (1) The land was to enjoy her sabbaths. Houbigant observes how literally this was fulfilled in the seventy years of the Babylonish Captivity. "From Saul to the Babylonish Captivity are numbered about four hundred and ninety years, during which period there were seventy sabbaths of years; for seven, multiplied by seventy, make four hundred and ninety. Now, the Babylonish Captivity lasted

seventy years, and during that time the land of Israel rested. Therefore the land rested just as many years in the Babylonish Captivity as it should have rested sabbaths if the Jews had observed the law relative to the sabbaths of the land." (2) The longer term of "seven times" thrice repeated (vers. 21, 24, 28) is also notable. These are the "times of the Gentiles," during which Jerusalem is to be trodden down of them (Luke xxi. 24). 5. *Meanwhile their land was to lie desolate* (vers. 31—35). (1) Such has been its history, under the Romans, under the Saracens, under the Crusaders, under the Turks. (2) Who but God could have foreseen all this? How unreasonable is unbelief!—J. A. M.

Vers. 40—46.—*Hope for Israel.* The curses of this chapter have proved prophetic. So, may we infer, will the blessings prove. We may therefore hope to see the conversion of the Hebrews to Christ, their restoration to their ancient inheritance, and the sun of prosperity shining brightly upon them.

I. **THEY WILL CONFESS THEIR SIN.** 1. *Their personal iniquity.* (1) They will have many things to confess, as all sinners have. They will "humble their uncircumcised heart" (see Jer. ix. 26; Rom. ii. 29). (2) In particular they will confess their capital sin in rejecting Christ. This crime filled up the measure of their fathers. 2. *The iniquity of their fathers.* (1) This was the same as their own. They will acknowledge themselves, not in pride, but in penitence, to be the children of their fathers. (2) Instead of attempting to extenuate their sin because of the example of their fathers, they will repent for the sin of their fathers as well as for their own. This is in accordance with the principle of the visitation of the iniquities of the fathers upon the children. 3. *The justice of God in their punishment.* (1) They acknowledge that they walked contrary to God (see Ezra ix.; Neh. i. 4; ix. 1, 2, 29; Dan. ix. 3, 4). (2) That he has therefore walked contrary to them. Afflictions do not spring out of the dust.

II. **THEN GOD WILL REMEMBER HIS COVENANT.** Therefore: 1. *He will not destroy them utterly.* (1) His providence will be over them. What else could have preserved them now for nineteen centuries amidst untoward circumstances? They are, notwithstanding their sufferings, as numerous to-day as they were in the zenith of their prosperity in the days of Solomon. (2) The remnant of them shall be saved. (3) How tender is the compassion of God! (Hos. xi. 8, 9). 2. *He will reinstate them in their land.* (1) He will remember his land. For in the covenant they are promised the land "for ever." (2) Remembering the land also implies that it will recover its ancient fruitfulness (see promises, vers. 4, 5, 10). (3) In that condition it will be the appropriate type and pledge of the heavenly country (see Isa. lxii. 4). 3. *He will make them a blessing in the earth.* (1) They will grow into a multitude. (2) They will rejoice in spiritual blessings. (3) The miracles of the Exodus from Egypt will be repeated. (4) The heathen will be startled into thoughtfulness (ver. 45). (5) The heathen will once more learn the way of salvation from the lips of Hebrews. 4. *In all this they are beloved for the fathers' sakes.* (1) This is distinctly stated (ver. 42; comp. Rom. xi. 28). (2) The patriarchs of the covenant are referred to in the order of ascent, viz. Jacob, Isaac, Abraham. Note: when the Jews in humility confess themselves the children of their more recent sinful fathers, God will acknowledge them as the children of their earlier faithful ancestors. (3) It is an encouragement to faith that the memory of Divine mercy is far-reaching—everlasting.—J. A. M.

Ver. 1.—*Idolatry: our danger and our security.* Knowing, as we do, how widespread was the idolatry of the age and how terribly tempted were the children of Israel to fall under its fascination, we do not wonder either at the *repetition* or the *fulness* of this commandment. God made it quite clear to his people, and impressed the truth on their minds with strong emphasis, that they must not permit any visible image to come between themselves and him. He would sanction "no idol, nor graven image, nor pillar, nor figured stone" (marginal reading). Respecting idolatry we may do well to consider—

I. **ITS NATURAL HISTORY.** Men do not descend at once into the blind and blank idolatry with which we are familiar. 1. The first step downwards is when men take some object or construct some image which shall remind them of Deity, or stand for God, or be a sign and token of his presence, so that when they *see that* they shall *think*

*of him.* This was the case with the “golden calf” which Aaron made. The people presented their offerings to it in connection with a “feast to the Lord” (Exod. xxxii. 5). It is too great a mental labour to realize God’s presence by pure thought and meditation; men crave a visible object which shall remind them of the Supreme. 2. The next step—deep into the thick darkness—is to identify the Deity with the object which is the chosen sign of his presence; and the constant, inevitable accompaniment of this act is to multiply the number of divinities; for, as the visible images are many, the gods become many also to the popular imagination. However antecedently unlikely it may seem to us that men would commit such great folly as this, universal history compels us to believe that they have done so. Beginning with the demand for “a sign,” men have “bowed down unto” and worshipped the image, the pillar, the figured stone. 3. Then follows mental, moral, spiritual degradation. The worshippers of idols have attributed to their gods their own infirmities and sins, and then their worship has reacted on their own character, and they have sunk to the lowest depths of abjectness of mind, vileness of spirit, grossness of life.

II. ITS ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS. We must not identify idolatry with those more shameless forms of it which historians and travellers have made known to us. These are its last and worst developments. But the idolatrous element is found where there is (1) a false association of God with an object with which he has nothing to do, as (in the case referred to) where the Israelites associated Jehovah in their thoughts with an image with which he had no connection whatever; or (2) a false trust in an object with which God is more or less connected. That was an idolatrous act on the part of the Israelites when they made sure of victory because the ark of God was in the camp (1 Sam. iv. 3—11). God had connected himself with the ark in an especial manner; but the Jews were trusting in *it* rather than in *him*, and they leant on a broken reed.

III. ITS APPEAL TO OURSELVES. Our danger is not from the grosser forms of idolatry, nor is it in the former of the two essential elements of it; it is in the latter of these. We are liable to trust idolatrously in that with which God is connected, but which has no virtue at all *in itself*. We are invited, and sometimes find ourselves tempted: 1. To imagine that a priest can bless us, independently of the truth which he teaches or the spiritual help which he renders us. 2. To suppose that we are nearer to God in sacred places, irrespective of the consideration whether we realize his presence and draw nigh to his Spirit. 3. To seek sanctity, or even salvation, in sacraments apart from the reverent thought and consecrated feeling which they should suggest or excite. This is an idolatrous delusion.

IV. THE PATH OF SAFETY. This is: 1. The avoidance of temptation. We must shun those Churches and services which would seduce us from spiritual purity. 2. The acceptance of the One Divine Mediator we have in Christ our Saviour. There is “one man we can adore without idolatry—the man Christ Jesus.” 3. The use of our faculties for the worship of the Invisible. We can worship him who is a Spirit “in spirit and in truth.” We can realize the presence of the infinite God; we can love him whom we have not seen (1 Pet. i. 8); we can walk the whole path of life conscious of a Divine Companion whose hand we cannot grasp, but who “leads us all our journey through.” By a living faith, “our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ” (1 John i. 3).—C.

Vers. 3—13.—*Incentives to obedience.* Religion has the first claim upon us as the supreme obligation of the soul. We are bound to worship and honour God because we owe far more to him than to all other beings in the universe. The first and all-sufficient reason why we should “worship and bow down” before him, is in the fact that “he is our God”—that One from whom we come, in whom we live, from whom cometh down every good gift. But God condescends to urge us to obedience by presenting incentives to our minds. He wishes us to consider that he has made it infinitely remunerative for us to do so; that, by so doing, we become recipients of the largest blessings he can confer and we can receive. There is so much of contrast as well as comparison between the blessings of the old and the new dispensations, that we must divide our subject into two parts.

I. THE INCENTIVES WHICH GOD HELD OUT TO HIS ANCIENT PEOPLE. These were *importantly spiritual, but prominently temporal.* If they did but “walk in his statutes,

and keep his commandments, and do them" (ver. 3), they might reckon on (1) fertility in the field (vers. 4, 5, 10); (2) sense of security from without and disturbance from within (safety and peace, vers. 5, 6); (3) victory in war (vers. 7, 8); (4) national growth (ver. 9); (5) God's presence with them (vers. 11, 12); (6) his pleasure in them (ver. 11); and (7) his guarantee of their liberty and self-respect (ver. 13).

II. THE PROMISES WHICH HE HAS MADE TO US. These are *partly temporal, but principally spiritual*. They include: 1. Sufficiency of worldly substance. God does not now say, "Serve me, and you shall be strong, wealthy, long-lived," but he does say, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God, . . . and all these things" (food, clothing, etc.) "shall be added unto you" (Matt. vi. 33). "Godliness has promise of the life that now is" (1 Tim. iv. 8). Those who are his children in Christ Jesus may reckon upon all needful support from his bountiful hand. 2. Consciousness of spiritual integrity. As God made his people to be delivered from the yoke and to "go upright" (ver. 13), so he makes those who have returned to him, and who have escaped from the yoke of sin, to "walk in uprightness of heart." Instead of shrinking in fear, bowing down with a depressing sense of wrong-doing, we have a happy consciousness of integrity of soul. We say with the psalmist, "As for me," etc. (Ps. xli. 12). 3. Sense of reconciliation with God. God promises peace and a sense of safety (vers. 5, 6) to those who seek his favour in Christ Jesus. Being justified by faith in him, we have peace with God; and we know that, whatever may be our circumstances, we are secure behind the shield of his almighty love. 4. Victory in the battle of life. If it be not wholly true that "our life is but a battle and a march," yet it is true that there is so much of spiritual struggle in it, from its beginning to its close, that we all understand only too well what is meant by "the battle of life." There are many foes with which to wrestle (Eph. vi. 12), and we need the invigorating power which only the Spirit of the Strong One can impart. If we are his, he will help us in the strife. "Our enemies will fall before us" (ver. 7; see 2 Cor. ii. 14 and Rom. viii. 37). 5. His presence with us and his pleasure in us. "God will set his tabernacle among us," he "will walk among us" (vers. 11, 12). He will be "with us always," and his sustaining presence will uphold us in the darkest hour, in the most trying scene. "His soul will not abhor us" (ver. 11); he will take Divine pleasure in us; we shall be his children, his guests, his friends, his heirs. 6. An everlasting heritage in him. He will be our God (ver. 12). The sacred page does not speak of any duration; but that which is adumbrated in the Old Testament is revealed in the New. Jesus Christ has brought life and immortality *out into the light*, and we know that "him that overcometh will the Son of man make a pillar in the temple of his God, and he shall go no more out," etc. (Rev. iii. 12), and that "to him that overcometh will he grant to sit with him on his throne," etc. (Rev. iii. 21). The present and the future, the best of the one and the whole of the other, are the heritage of those who "know the will of God and do it." Surely it is the choice of the wise to "make haste and delay not to keep his commandments."—C.

Vers. 23, 24.—*Our God and ourselves.* The text suggests the question, How far does God's treatment of us depend on our attitude towards him? And the answer must be somewhat complex.

I. IN LARGE MEASURE, GOD'S TREATMENT OF US IS QUITE IRRESPECTIVE OF OUR CONDUCT TOWARD HIM. He has done much for us from the promptings of his own generous and beneficent nature. As the sun gives light because it is light, regardless of the objects on which it shines, so our God, who is a Sun (Ps. lxxxiv. 11), is sending forth beams of truth, love, beauty, happiness, because in him is all fulness, and from that abundance there must flow blessing and bounty on every hand (see Ps. ciii. 10, 11; Matt. v. 45).

II. IN LARGE MEASURE, GOD'S TREATMENT OF US DEPENDS ON OUR ATTITUDE TOWARD HIM. 1. Right feeling on our part is reciprocated with kind feeling on his. If we love him, he will love us and come to us (John xiv. 23). 2. Rebellious conduct on our part brings down adverse action on his part. If we "will walk contrary to him, he will walk contrary to us, and punish us for our sins." The greater part of this chapter (vers. 14—39) is a terrible admonition that, if we provoke God by our wilful disobedience, we must expect to find his hand against us in all the paths of life, our growing iniquity meeting with his multiplying wrath and darkening retribution. 3. Repentant action on our

part is met by returning favour on his (Jer. iii. 22; Joel ii. 12—14; Isa. xliv. 22; lv. 7). Let the prodigal son arise to return, and, "while yet a great way off," the heavenly Father will run to meet and to welcome him (Luke xv.).

III. GOD'S GOODNESS TO US WILL SEEM TO US TO VARY ACCORDING TO THE RECTITUDE OF OUR SOULS TOWARD HIM. As men seem to us to be just or unjust, kind or unkind, according to the position we occupy toward them, so also does the Father of spirits. "All the paths of the Lord are" (and are seen to be) "mercy and truth unto such as keep his covenant and his testimonies" (Ps. xxv. 10). But the ways of the Lord will seem "contrary" to the rebellious. With the merciful man God shows himself merciful; with the froward he shows himself froward (Ps. xviii. 26). The guilty will exclaim against the inequality of God's dealings (Ezek. xxxiii. 17). *He will seem unjust because they are unholy, because their spirit is false and wrong* (Matt. xx. 15). Those who fear God and love his Son their Saviour, join in the psalm of the Church on earth, "The Lord is righteous in all his ways, . . . his tender mercies are over all his works" (Ps. cxlv.); they anticipate the strain of the Church in heaven, "Just and true are thy ways, thou King of saints" (Rev. xv. 3).—C.

Vers. 14—39.—*Divine retribution.* The Divine Legislator of Israel knew well that he must contemplate disobedience as well as obedience to his laws. When he had intimated the fulness of the reward he would bestow on the faithful, he was compelled to pass on to "But if ye will not hearken unto me, and will not do," etc. It is sad to think that it did not *need* Divine prescience to foretell this issue. Human disobedience is too constantly occurring a factor in human history to require that: it may always be safely assumed. We have now to deal with God's treatment of it; and we see—

I. THAT GOD PUNISHES IT WITH VARIOUS EVILS. (Vers. 14—18.) God always says to us, "If ye will not do my commandments, I will set my face against you." To the Israelites he threatened specifically: (1) bodily sickness; (2) unprofitable labour; (3) defeat in battle; (4) subjection to a hated rule; (5) ignominious terror and flight. If we sin we must expect to suffer in mind, body, or estate. Guilt and misery are necessarily conjoined. Sin deserves to suffer: there needs no further explanation of suffering than that God's holy and righteous Law has been transgressed. Yet, while the Divine Law-giver visits sin with retribution because it is *right* that it should receive this mark of his holy disapproval, it is also true—

II. THAT GOD'S PUNISHMENT IS MEANT TO BE REMEDIAL. "If ye will not yet for all this hearken unto me" (ver. 18). Then it is clear that these providential visitations would be meant to lead to a better spirit, to a disposition to hearken and to obey. God, when he punishes, not only does an act of righteous retribution, which his position as Supreme Judge demands of him, but he also does that which he desires shall lead to penitence and restoration. He smites us in one member that he may heal us altogether. He takes away a little that he may give very largely. He sends passing pain that he may give enduring joy. God's retrIBUTIONS are his "corrections," his paternal chastisements, his strong but kind admonitions. By them he lays his hand upon us and says to us, in tones we cannot fail to understand, "Repent and return, and be restored." But we learn from these verses—

III. THAT MAN TOO OFTEN REFUSES TO HEED THE DIVINE CORRECTION. "If ye will not yet for all this hearken" (ver. 18); "if ye will not hearken unto me" (ver. 21); "if ye will not be reformed by me by these things" (ver. 23). Often men do listen and learn and obey when God comes to them in sickness or in sorrow; but only too often they do not. They continue in or revert to their evil course, they fall again into crime, into vice, into unconcern, into indecision.

IV. THAT GOD LAYS A HEAVIER HAND ON PERSISTENT AND OBDURATE IMPENITENCE. He gave to his people fair and full warning of what they were to expect at his hand. They knew that obduracy on their part would entail gathering and growing evils, leading on and down to uttermost destruction. There would come the enmity of the elements, with consequent disaster in the field (vers. 19, 20); desolation and bereavement (ver. 22); pestilence and famine (vers. 25, 26); revolting and unnatural cruelties wrought among themselves (vers. 28, 29); exile and dispersion (ver. 33); terror of soul (vers. 36, 37); national destruction and impending extinction (vers. 38, 39). These solemn and fearful threatenings are, no doubt, directed against Israel, the specially

instructed people. As God "exalted that land unto heaven" in privilege and opportunity, so he "brought it down to hell" in condemnation and doom. But when we remember with what retribution God visited the sins of the antediluvian world, of the cities of the plain, the Canaanites, the great cities of Babylon and Nineveh, and when we recall the sufferings and humiliations he has brought down on lands and cities in more modern times, we may conclude that those nations which will not learn when God speaks to them in wrath and in "his high displeasure" may look forward to a time of gathering disaster and final ruin.

God's retributive dealings with nations have their counterpart in his action toward individual lives. Men who sin and suffer, and who will not learn by the things they suffer, may take to heart the truth that God's manifested wrath will reach them here or will overtake them hereafter; they may well wish that it may arrive soon rather than late, for as time passes and as sin indurates and blinds the soul, there is the less likelihood that the sacred lesson will be learnt before death shuts the book of opportunity, and eternity opens that other book of judgment and award.—C.

**Vers. 40—45.—Sorrow unto salvation.** The chastisements of God, like the gospel of Jesus Christ, are either a savour of life unto life or of death unto death; they either make or mar; they may sanctify and save or they may leave the soul more bound in the bonds of sin than ever. It is only godly sorrow—sorrow regarded in a true light and treated in the way that God intended—that works repentance unto salvation; otherwise it works death (2 Cor. vii. 10). The right use of affliction is indicated in the text; there must be—

I. **A SENSE OF ILL DESERT.** The uncircumcised heart must be humbled (ver. 41). God seeks by his chastisements to break our pride, our haughtiness of heart, our sinful self-complacency. Until this is done nothing is done. When the soul is at ease in its iniquity, it is in a very "far country," a long way from God, truth, salvation. When trouble touches and pierces our complacency, filling the soul with a sense of its rebelliousness, as soon as the heart says, "I have sinned," a large part of the work of the correcting hand is wrought. Then necessarily and readily follows—

II. **THE LANGUAGE OF CONFESSION.** Directly the heart feels the lip speaks. Too often men use the language of penitence when the feeling is entirely absent. But he that searcheth the hearts makes due distinction between the words which are true and those which are false. There is nothing gained with God by adopting the language which we ought to be disposed to use, but which does not express our actual condition; everything unreal is offensive in his sight. But there is much gained by the simple, natural, heartfelt utterance of penitential feeling. "If they shall confess their iniquity," etc. (vers. 40—42). "With the mouth confession is made unto salvation" (Rom. x. 10). The spirit thus taught of God through his servant, sorrow, has now—

III. **THE SUBJECT WILL.** It "accepts of the punishment of its iniquity" (ver. 41). It says, "Surely it is meet to be said unto God, I have borne chastisement, I will not offend any more: that which I see not teach thou me," etc. (Job xxxiv. 31, 32). It is "in subjection unto the Father of spirits" (Heb. xii. 9). It submits to his guidance and surrenders itself to his will. And then comes—

IV. **DIVINE RESTORATION.** God "remembers his covenant" (vers. 42, 45). As he remembered the covenant he made with the ancestors of the children of Israel, and "did not abhor them" (ver. 44), but withdrew his anger from them, so he remembers his promise with us, sealed with a Saviour's blood, to pardon our sins and to restore our souls to his Divine favour. Yet there are—

V. **LINGERING CONSEQUENCES OF SIN.** With penitent Israel, toward whom God was extending his mercy, "the land also was to be left of them, and was to enjoy her sabbaths, while she lay desolate without them" (ver. 43). With us, when penitent and restored, when taken back into the family and kingdom of God, there are lingering consequences of sin which even Divine mercy does not, cannot remove—consequences in: (1) miserable memories which will visit the mind; (2) enfeebled faculty that must work in a lesser sphere with smaller influence; (3) diminished reputation among men; (4) abiding results in those who have been injured, and who are beyond the reach of our restoration, etc. While facing this solemn fact—a fact which makes sin seem to us the stern, sad, hurtful thing it is—we may nevertheless find a glad relief in recalling—

VI. THE BLESSED HOPE OF THE HOLY. There is a country where the penal consequences of sin will be so removed from sight and sense that to our consciousness they will exist no more. Sin and sorrow shall never cross the stream that "divides that heavenly land from ours;" they must always remain on this side of it. What will remain to us there is a remembrance that will enhance our joy—a recollection of sin that has been forgiven, and of sorrow that has been endured, both the one and the other magnifying the mercy of our crowned and exalted King.—C.

Vers. 3—8.—*Obedience and prosperity.* The connection between godly conduct and material good may not seem to us so close or so clearly discernible as that which is promised in these verses. Still, the heart of the promise remains, and instances have never been wanting to prove that "godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come." The prophecy of Amos (ix. 13)—evidently founded on this passage of the Law—refers to gospel times, and reminds us that the declarations of the text are capable of a spiritual application which invests them with deeper meaning and grander results.

I. THE PROPRIETY OF OBEDIENCE. 1. *Man is unfit to guide his own way.* "It is not in man that walketh to direct his steps." He is a creature swayed by passion, short-sighted, fallible in judgment. Nor can the united wisdom of the multitude secure the framing of a code free from prejudice and error. We may consult the instructions of Scripture as our unsailing chart; we may listen to its precepts as the helmsman does to the commands of the captain, assured that from his loftier position he can better determine the course the vessel ought to take. 2. *The Almighty possesses irresistible claims upon our obedience.* He is our Creator and Governor, Father and Benefactor. He has bestowed upon us all our earthly and our spiritual benefits, and in particular spared not his only Son for our sakes. Supremely wise and holy, we cannot without manifest incongruity refuse to follow his counsel and rule of life. We are rebels if we neglect his injunctions. To pick and choose which we will conform to is to assume presumptuous functions. 3. *The statutes are such as to commend themselves upon maturest reflection.* Any precept plainly contrary to reason or morality no will has power to enforce. But the hexaplar verdict of the psalmist will be pronounced by all who study the laws of God, "The statutes of the Lord are right," etc. (Ps. xix. 7—9). The teachings of Jesus Christ are a master-piece of skill, goodness, and purity. If universally adhered to, the world would become an Eden.

II. THE REWARD OF OBEDIENCE. 1. *Blessings are promised to the obedient. Plenty.* The ground shall be fertile, the fruit gathered in harvest shall more than suffice to carry the husbandman on to the next ingathering. The gospel does at any rate teach Christian stoicism, making a man contented with his lot, and he who has sufficient for his wants cannot complain. But in the spiritual region we may have a never-ceasing flow of gifts. For God is bountiful, and loves to grant richest graces unto his people. If only we are prepared to receive, the floodgates of his bounty will be opened. *Peace.* They shall dwell at home in safety, none causing terror. Strife amongst God's own people shall be unknown, the inestimable blessing of tranquillity shall diffuse its sweetness over the land. "Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace whose mind is stayed on thee." Calm of conscience is the peculiar privilege of the believer in Christ. Bodily suffering cannot destroy this peace. The testimony of a well-known minister on his death-bed recently was, "Within I have deep peace, though around is constant searching pain." *Victory,* if foes attempt to molest. The Christian life is a warfare, and this is quite consistent with the enjoyment of peace. It is an external sphere of conflict, the enemy is determined and active, "but thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ." The obedient soldiers are likeliest to come off conquerors when the general is skilled in strategy. And as Havelock's men, by their observance of moral rules, were ever prepared for duty, so are those who conform to the precepts of Christ certain of success in the struggle against sin. The association is much more intimate between obedience and spiritual triumph than that which is here promised in the Law. 2. *These blessings are eminently desirable.* It speaks a wise and gracious God to have made it so greatly men's interest to keep his laws. In any case we are bound to do what seems right, yet, if this conduct were not coincident with advantage, life would be a melancholy scene. Peace, plenty, and victory are just what

the heart desiderates and men strive to attain. God will not offer what men contemn. It is true that the degraded may at first fail to appreciate the joys of prosperity and tranquillity, yet education is possible, and even brief reasoning must convince of the value of these inducements. 3. *The list is comprehensive.* There is material prosperity and moral good, and in the following verses religious satisfaction is promised—God dwelling in the midst of his people. Nothing that can add to man's real happiness is absent from the catalogue of pleasures to be participated in by the obedient.

III. GENERAL REFLECTIONS. 1. *There is nothing wrong in allowing ourselves to be influenced by the promise of rewards.* Man is compelled to anticipate; prudence is a virtue. All depends upon the character of the rewards. If they minister to base, ignoble lusts, then to be moved thereby is indicative of an evil state of mind. But if the blessings are legitimate and elevating, in accordance with principles implanted by our Maker, then the hope of obtaining them is a strong incitement to be cherished rather than checked. To impel men to a holy life by preaching the bliss and glory of heaven is surely allowable and to be commended. 2. *The worth of these rewards will be enhanced by a consideration of the misery of their opposites*—want, turmoil, and defeat. Such is the lot of those who follow their own devices, blindly hurrying to ruin. The prodigal imagined that he must see the world and leave his father's home in order to be happy, but he soon discovered his dire mistake. 3. *History proves God's faithfulness to his word.* As long as the Israelites kept the Law, their condition was one of security, development, and honour. Every age has testified to the fulfilment of Divine declarations, forcing from the sceptical an acknowledgment of "a power that makes for righteousness." Seeking first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, all other things have been added. On the other hand, it has been found hard to kick against the pricks. What Carlyle terms the "eternities" war against the evil-doer. As predictions have been fulfilled in the past, so we are confident that all the promises of God shall ultimately be realized in the experience of his faithful servants.—S. R. A.

Ver. 11.—*God dwelling amongst men.* All possible methods were employed to attach the Israelites to the Law. Solemnity of its promulgation, judgment executed on transgressors, enticing promises and terrifying threats. Chief among inducements to obedience was the promise of the text.

I. SETTING UP A TABERNACLE IMPLIES. 1. *Settled residences in the midst of the people.* This was more than an occasional appearance on the mountain-top or in the wilderness. A tent is, at least for a season, a fixed abode. The Almighty would never be far distant from his liege as he had seemed to be in preceding years. 2. *Friendly, familiar intercourse with the people.* He condescended to their manner of life, inhabiting a home as they did, passing as it were from one to the other. This is expressed in ver. 12, "I will walk among you." Naught of pollution was suffered for the reason given in Deut. xxiii. 14, "The Lord thy God walketh in the midst of the camp." A special revelation of God is intimated, that he would be known, not as omnipresent in space, but as peculiarly present, interchanging visits with his people. 3. *The assurance of Divine blessing.* Guidance, assistance, forgiveness,—all are herein included. God would be always near to be entreated. At the tabernacle sacrifices could be offered to purge away defilement. "The heathen shall know that I the Lord do sanctify Israel, when my sanctuary shall be in the midst of them for evermore" (Ezek. xxxvii. 28), God's presence is superior to any of his works; if we have him, we have all good things guaranteed.

II. THE PEOPLE OF GOD MAY WELL WONDER THAT HE SHOULD DELIGHT IN THEM AND NOT VIEW THEM WITH ABHORRENCE. To abide with man would be impossible if disgust were continually uppermost in the mind of God. 1. *Consider man's sinfulness.* How repugnant to the pure and holy One of Israel is every thought of iniquity, much less its overt commission! How often must he be shocked at the sights and sounds that gratify sinful creatures? Peter, awakened to a sense of his unworthiness, cried out, "Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord." 2. *Consider man's imperfections,* his ignorance and frailty, his dulness of perception, his insensibility to refined and elevated tastes and emotions. If one nurtured in good society revolts at the idea of close communion with those inferior in the social scale, whose manner of life and habits of thinking are so different, how great must be the disparity between heaven and earth!

what a descent must God feel it to be to consort with creatures of such petty selfish aims and uncultured ways! Only real pitying love, a desire to benefit and raise these miserable objects, a vision of what it was possible for them to become by such fellowship with the Most High, could have invested men with sufficient interest in the eyes of God to permit him to dwell amongst them. If the people strive to fulfil the behests of the Law, much of their degradation will vanish, and be succeeded by integrity and righteousness, which shall gradually beautify their character and customs. "My soul shall not abhor you," if you honour my precepts by strict fidelity.

III. THE PROMISE VERIFIED. 1. *In the local habitation of God* at Shiloh and Jerusalem. There God placed his Name and exhibited his power and favour. 2. *In his personal manifestation in Christ Jesus.* "In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." "The Word . . . dwelt among us." Then was answered the question, "Will God in very deed dwell with man upon the earth?" Christ sojourned like ourselves in a house of clay, mingling with men and women in their daily tasks, sat at the same table with publicans and sinners. 3. *In the presence of God spiritually* in the heart of the individual believer, in the Church of Christ as a whole, making it the temple of God, and in the various assemblies, small or great, of the saints. "Where two or three are gathered together in my Name, there am I in the midst of them." The grandest fulfilment will be when the Lord God Almighty shall himself constitute the temple in which they shall offer their worship and service. "He that sitteth on the throne shall dwell among (spread his tabernacle over) them." No more hungering nor thirsting, no death, sorrow, nor crying, when God shall thus absolutely completely draw near to his people.—S. R. A.

Vers. 1, 2.—*Command to maintain the public worship of Jehovah.* I. PURITY OF WORSHIP. No idols or images. 1. *Spirituality* of religion. 2. Dependence of man on *revelation*. The deistic position of natural religion untenable. 3. The worship of God should be the free and grateful remembrance of past benefits received, therefore the leading elements of it should be faith and praise, not, as in heathenism and corrupt Christian systems such as the Roman Catholic, the slavish subjection of man to the fear of Divine wrath and the mediation of priests.

II. CONSECRATION BOTH OF DAY AND PLACE. Sabbath and sanctuary. 1. As necessary on account of the weakness of our nature. We cannot keep the mind above the world unless we are separated at times altogether from it. 2. The rallying point of fellowship. In the communion of saints there is special spiritual help. 3. As maintaining the holy order of human life, giving distinction and eminence to the highest things, predicting the future rest, revealing the dependence of the bodily life on the life of the soul, and of the happiness of earthly toil on the blessing of God. 4. The Christian sabbath as based on the resurrection of Christ has a new form of obligation and a larger sphere of holy suggestion. It is not so much commanded as vitally connected with the whole strength of Christian motive.—R.

Vers. 3—39.—*Promises and threatenings.* Ver. 12, "And I will walk among you, and will be your God, and ye shall be my people."

I. The true law of human life. 1. Religion the upholding support of individual, social, national well-being. Natural laws subservient to higher ends. Ascending scale in the universe, the physical the basis of the psychical, the psychical of the moral, the moral of the spiritual. 2. The covenant relationship of God and man the only true form in which the ideas of religion can be realized and maintained. Personality of God, freedom of man. Interchange of confidence. Living communion. Support of prayer, which should embrace all wants and possibilities. 3. Illustration of the connection between providence and religion in the history both of individuals and nations. Importance of insisting on the truths contained in this chapter as against secularism and fanaticism and mysticism. Religion is objective as well as subjective. Tremendous fact that notwithstanding both the promises and threatenings, Israel failed to keep the Law. Illustration of human fall and dependence on Divine grace.

II. Divine government. 1. Righteous. 2. Merciful. 3. Revealed in connection with a system of truth and actual promises appealing to faith. 4. Embracing those who know not God, as well as his people.—R.

Ver. 21.—*Threatenings.* I. Actually fulfilled in history of the Jews, especially at siege of Jerusalem, A.D. 70.

II. Illustrating the moral nature of man as connected with a moral government.

III. Taken in order of announcement after the promises, reminding us that God willeth not the death of a sinner. The brightness of the love on the background of righteousness.—R.

Vers. 40—46.—*The gracious invitation to repentance.* The covenant may be restored. Even in the midst of the declarations of Divine sovereignty and government, long-suffering mercy meets “the earliest and faintest breathings of a broken and penitent spirit.”

I. Confirm by history (see Judges and Kings). The restoration from Babylon. All consummated in Messiah.

II. The free grace of God is the foundation of hope; “I am the Lord their God;” “I will remember;” “for all that I will not cast them away;” “of faith, that it might be by grace.”

III. The forgiveness of God dependent on the fulfilment of declared conditions. “If they shall confess;” “if their uncircumcised heart be humbled.” 1. Spirituality of religion maintained from the beginning. 2. The purpose and end of all Divine chastisements to produce an acceptable state of heart. 3. The true penitence was the true circumcision, in other words, it was a renewal of the covenant, therefore included faith and acceptance of the Divine revelation and ordinances. Repentance and faith are one in the higher light of the gospel, for they are both “*toward*” the covenant in Christ Jesus.—R.

## APPENDIX.

### EXPOSITION.

#### CHAPTER XXVII.

This final chapter, attached to the book after the concluding exhortation, is a short treatise on persons (vers. 2—8), animals (vers. 9—13), houses (vers. 14, 15), lands (vers. 16—24), vowed to God; and on the commutation of vows.

A man might vow to the service of God whatever he had a right over, that is, himself, his wife, his children, his slaves, his beasts, his houses, his fields. In case persons were vowed, the rule was that they should be redeemed at a certain price, though occasionally the redemption was not made. Vowing a person to God thus, was, as a rule, no more than vowing so much money to the use of the sanctuary as was fixed as the price of the redemption of the person vowed. Yet there is a great difference between the two acts of vowing a person and vowing the correlative sum of money. A man in great danger or distress might devote himself (Gen. xxviii. 20) or another (Judg. xi. 30; 1 Sam. i. 11)

to God, when he never would have vowed money. Such vows were redeemable, and, as a rule, were redeemed, though there were some exceptions, as in the case of Samuel.

If beasts were vowed to the Lord (vers. 9—13), they could not be redeemed if they were such as could be sacrificed to him; if they were not such as could be sacrificed, they were to be valued by the priest, and either retained as a possession of the sanctuary, or, if the owner preferred it, redeemed by him at the price fixed and one-fifth additional.

If houses were vowed to the Lord (vers. 14, 15), they became the property of the sanctuary, unless they were redeemed at the valuation set upon them by the priest, with one-fifth additional.

If hereditary lands were vowed to the Lord (vers. 16—21), they became the possession of the sanctuary at the year of jubilee, unless they had been previously redeemed; redemption, however, was in this case the ordinary rule, and we do not

hear of any accumulation of landed property in the hands of the priests from this source. In the case of a field which was not an hereditary possession, but a purchase, being vowed to the Lord (vers. 22—24), the commutation sum was paid down “*in that day*,” that is, on the spot in a lump sum, the land going back at the jubilee to the original owners from whom the temporary possession had been bought by the man who made the vow.

A section is added forbidding the first-born of animals, things devoted, and tithes to be vowed, because they were already the Lord's; allowing the redemption of the firstborn of unclean animals, and of the tithes of corn and fruits, but prohibiting redemption in the case of sacrificial animals, of things devoted, and of the tithes of animals.

Ver. 2.—*When a man shall make a singular vow*,—literally, *when a man shall separate a vow*, that is, *make a special vow* (see Numb. vi. 2)—the persons shall be for the Lord by thy estimation; that is, when a man has vowed himself or another person to the Lord, the priest shall declare the amount at which the person vowed is to be redeemed.

Vers. 3—7.—The sum at which a man between twenty and sixty years of age was to be redeemed was fifty shekels, equal to £6 9s. 2d.; a woman, thirty shekels, or £3 17s. 6d.; a youth between five and twenty years of age, twenty shekels, or £2 11s. 8d.; a maiden between the same ages, ten shekels, or £1 5s. 10d.; a boy between one month and five years, five shekels, or 12s. 11d.; a girl between the same ages, three shekels, or 7s. 9d.; a man above sixty years, fifteen shekels, or £1 18s. 9d.; a woman of the same age, ten shekels, or £1 5s. 10d.

Ver. 8.—A discretion is left with the priest to lower these valuations in case the man who has made the vow is very poor. According to his ability that vowed shall the priest value him.

Vers. 9, 10.—In case a clean animal is vowed to the Lord, it is not to be exchanged for another on the plea of not being good enough or being too good for sacrifice. If any such attempt is made, both animals are to be given up and sacrificed, or, if blemished, added to the herd of the sanctuary.

Vers. 11—13.—An unclean animal, which might not be sacrificed, if vowed, was to be valued at a price fixed by the priest. If its original owner took it back again, he was to pay this price and one-fifth more than

the sum named; if he did not, it became the property of the sanctuary. The words, *the priest shall value it, whether it be good or bad*, should rather be rendered, *the priest shall estimate it between good and bad*, that is, at a moderate price, as though it were neither very good nor very bad. And so in the next verse.

Vers. 14, 15.—The rule as to the redemption of houses is the same as that regarding the redemption of unclean animals. The ordinary practice was to redeem.

Vers. 16—21.—In case a man shall sanctify unto the Lord some part of a field of his possession, that is, of his hereditary lands, the redemption price is fixed by the quantity of seed required for sowing it. If it requires a homer, or five bushels and a half, of barley seed to crop it, the redemption price is fifty shekels, or £6 9s. 2d., *plus* one-fifth, that is, £7 15s., supposing that the vow had been made in the year succeeding the jubilee; but if the vow was made at any time after the jubile, the value of the previous harvests was deducted from this sum. The amount does not seem to have been paid in a lump sum, but by annual instalments of one shekel and one-fifth of a shekel, equal to 3s. 1*1* d., each year. In case he had sold his interest in the field up to the approaching jubilee before making his vow, then no redemption was allowed; he paid nothing, but the field passed from him to the sanctuary at the jubilee.

Vers. 22—24.—The case of a man who shall sanctify unto the Lord a field which he hath bought, which is not of the fields of his possession, or *inheritance*, is necessarily different, because he was not the owner of the land, but only the possessor of it until the next jubilee. For this reason he had to pay the redemption price immediately in that day, the land, of course, reverting to the original owner at the jubilee.

Vers. 25.—The estimation is to be made according to the shekel of the sanctuary, that is, the shekel at its full value, before worn by use in traffic (see Exod. xxx. 13; Numb. iii. 47; xviii. 16).

Vers. 26—28.—The law of vows and their commutation is further declared in four subjects: (1) the firstborn of animals; (2) things already devoted; (3) tithes of the produce of the land; (4) tithes of the produce of the cattle.

Vers. 26—28.—The firstborn of animals were already the Lord's, and they could not, therefore, be vowed to him afresh; the sacrificial animals were to be offered in sacrifice (Exod. xiii. 15); the ass was to be redeemed by a sheep or be put to death (Exod. xiii. 19; xxxiv. 20); other unclean animals are to be either redeemed at the fixed price, *plus* one-fifth, or, if not re-

deemed, sold for the benefit of the sanctuary.

Vera 28, 29.—Whatever is already *cherem* (a word here first used as a term well understood), that is, *devoted* to God, whether devoted for the purpose of destruction or of entire surrender to him, may be neither redeemed nor sold. Whether it be of man, like the Canaanites at Hormah (Numb. xxi. 2), or of beast, as the sheep and oxen of the Amalekites (1 Sam. xv. 21), or of the field, as referred to in ver. 21, or of other inanimate objects, as the cities of Hormah (Numb. xxi. 2), it is either to be put to death or given up without reserve or commutation to God's ministers. In the case of men they must be put to death. "This provision would have applied only to the devoting of those who were already manifestly under the ban of Jehovah—those guilty of such outrageous and flagrant violation of the fundamental law of the covenant that they manifestly came under the penalty of death. Such persons, instead of being tried and condemned, might be at once devoted and put to death" (Gardiner). "To this it may be added that the devotion by ban (*cherem*) of any object or person was not to be done by private persons, at their own will, but was performed by the civil magistrates, under known conditions and laws; e.g. the cities of idolaters, such as Jericho, were so devoted, and the inhabitants, by the command of God himself, who made his people to be the executioners of his judgments against inveterate idolat-

try (see Deut. xiii. 13; Josh. vi. 17)" (Wordsworth).

Vers. 30—32.—Tithes, like the *cherem*, are introduced as things well known. Abraham gave tithes to Melchizedek (Gen. xiv. 20; Heb. vii. 4). Jacob vowed the tenth to the Lord (Gen. xxviii. 22), whence we see that the practice of the payment of tithes was not of Mosaic institution, but immemorial. The duty was, however, commanded afresh for the Israelites. "I have given the children of Levi all the tenth in Israel for an inheritance, for their service which they serve, even the service of the tabernacle" (Numb. xviii. 21), and of this tithe they were to pay a tenth to the priests (Numb. xviii. 26). Being already the Lord's, the tithe of the corn and fruits could not be vowed to the Lord, but it could be redeemed, or commuted, by the owner paying one-fifth more than the price at which it was valued.

Vers. 32, 33.—The tithe of the cattle could neither be vowed nor redeemed. As the young oxen and sheep passed under the rod by which they were counted by the herdsman, the tenth animal was touched (the rod, according to tradition, having been dipped in red paint), and handed over to the Levites. There was to be no change made in the animals, nor was commutation allowed.

Vers. 34.—The final verse of the previous chapter is repeated after the further legislation on vows and on their commutation has been added, to show that it too makes part of the Sinaitic code.

#### HOMILETICS.

Vers. 1—34.—Vows are not instituted by the Mosaic legislation; they were already in existence as a habit of the Hebrew people, and they are only regulated by Moses. The principle on the subject of vows is that no one was bound to make a vow, but that when a vow was made, it must be observed by the payment of the thing vowed or its recognized commutation. Thus Deut. xxiii. 21, "When thou shalt vow a vow unto the Lord thy God, thou shalt not slack to pay it: for the Lord thy God will surely require it of thee; and it would be sin in thee. But if thou shalt forbear to vow, it shall be no sin in thee." And Numb. xxx. 2, "If a man vow a vow unto the Lord, or swear an oath to bind his soul with a bond; he shall not break his word, he shall do according to all that proceedeth out of his mouth." And Eccles. v. 5, "Better is it that thou shouldest not vow, than that thou shouldest vow and not pay."

I. OLD TESTAMENT VOWS WERE PROMISES TO GOD TO GIVE UP TO HIM SOMETHING OF VALUE ON CONDITION OF DELIVERANCE IN DISTRESS OR HELP IN ATTAINING SOMETHING DESIRED. Examples: 1. Jacob's vow: "And Jacob vowed a vow, saying, If God will be with me, and will keep me in this way that I go, and will give me bread to eat, and raiment to put on, so that I come again to my father's house in peace; then shall the Lord be my God: and this stone, which I have set for a pillar, shall be God's house: and of all that thou shalt give me I will surely give the tenth unto thee" (Gen. xxviii. 20—22). 2. Jephthah's vow: "And Jephthah vowed a vow unto the Lord, and said, If thou shalt without fail deliver the children of Ammon into mine hands, then it shall be, that whatsoever cometh forth of the doors of my house to meet me, when I return in peace from the children of Ammon, shall surely be the Lord's, and (or) I will offer it up

for a burnt offering" (Judg. xi. 30, 31). What Jephthah appeared to contemplate as likely to meet him was either a non-sacrificial animal, which would then be handed over to the sanctuary (ch. xxvii. 11—13), or a sacrificial animal, which would be offered up. His daughter came under the first head (ch. xxvii. 9, 10). 3. Hannah's vow: "And she vowed a vow, and said, O Lord of hosts, if thou wilt indeed look on the affliction of thine handmaid, and remember me, and not forget thine handmaid, but wilt give unto thine handmaid a man child, then I will give him unto the Lord all the days of his life, and there shall no razor come upon his head" (1 Sam. i. 11). 4. Absalom's pretended vow: "For thy servant vowed a vow while I abode at Geshur in Syria, saying, If the Lord shall bring me again indeed to Jerusalem, then I will serve the Lord (offer sacrifices in Hebron)" (2 Sam. xv. 8).

II. CHRISTIAN VOWS ARE PROMISES MADE TO GOD, DIFFERING FROM THE JEWISH VOW BY BEING INDEPENDENT OF ANY DELIVERANCE OR BENEFIT TO BE RECEIVED IN RETURN. Examples: 1. The baptismal vow, ratified and confirmed in Confirmation: "Wilt thou then obediently keep God's holy will and commandments, and walk in the same all the days of thy life? I will." "Do you here, in the presence of God, and of this congregation, renew the solemn promise and vow that was made in your name at your baptism; ratifying and confirming the same in your own person? I do" (Baptism and Confirmation Services). 2. The marriage vow: "Wilt thou have this woman to thy wedded wife, to live together after God's ordinance in the holy estate of matrimony?" "Wilt thou have this man to thy wedded husband, to live together after God's ordinance in the holy estate of matrimony?" "I will" (Form of Solemnization of Matrimony). 3. The ordination vow: "Will you then give your faithful diligence always so to minister the doctrine and sacraments, and the discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Church and realm hath received the same, according to the commandments of God?" "I will so do, by the help of the Lord" (The Ordering of Priests).

III. THE CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH VOWS AND OATHS ARE NOT, OR CEASE TO BE, OBLIGATORY. Jeremiah writes (iv. 2), "And thou shalt swear, The Lord liveth, in truth, in judgment, and in righteousness." Isaiah speaks of those "which swear by the Name of the Lord, and make mention of the God of Israel, but not in truth, nor in righteousness" (Isa. xlvi. 1). Accordingly, any oath or vow which was an unrighteous oath or vow when taken; and the sin of breaking it, though a sin, is less than that of keeping it. Therefore Herod ought not to have kept his oath to the daughter of Herodias (Matt. xiv. 9); and the observance of their oath by the forty conspirators who had bound themselves to kill Paul, would have been a sin on their part (Acts xxiii. 12—21). Further, a vow, as distinct from an oath or contract, ceases to be obligatory if the person concerned comes to regard it as unrighteous and wrong for him to fulfil with his changed mind or under changed circumstances. Thus, the vow taken at ordination to administer the sacraments in the form received by a special Church, is not binding if a man ceases on conscientious grounds to be a member of that Church, and the vow of celibacy taken by Luther and others, who have become reformers, no longer binds them when they have come to the conviction that the vow was unrighteous, and when they have rejected the discipline of their Church. The marriage vow, however, stands upon a different basis, because marriage is a contract, containing not only a vow to God, but also a promise to man, by the non-fulfilment of which wrong would be done.<sup>1</sup>

#### HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

*On keeping vows.* Ch. xxvii.; cf. Eccles. v. 4, 5; Gen. xxviii. 20—22; xxxv. 1—7. We have in this apparent appendix to the book an interesting chapter about keeping vows. Religious enthusiasm may very properly express itself in the dedication either of one's self, or a relative in whose destiny we have a voice, or a beast, or a house, or finally a field. Such a sense of special obligation may be laid upon us that we feel

<sup>1</sup> The best treatise on this difficult subject is Bishop Sanderson's 'Seven Lectures Concerning the Obligation of Promissory Oaths,' delivered in Latin, at Oxford, and translated by the command of Charles I.

constrained to dedicate either a person, an animal, or a piece of property unto God. But it may be highly inconvenient for the priests to accept of the dedicated article at the tabernacle. It may be much more convenient to receive, in lieu thereof, its money equivalent, and so a scale of charges is here given, according to which the vow's value is to be estimated.

I. WE MUST DEDICATE IN THIS SPECIAL WAY ONLY WHAT LIES BEYOND THE LORD'S USUAL DUES. The tithes, the firstlings, and the Nazarites may be regarded as the Lord's ordinary dues. We have no right to "make a fuss" about what is lawfully his own. The margin beyond the tithe is broad enough from which to make our special vows without encroaching upon the tithe. Let the nine-tenths or the four-fifths, according as we regard a single or a double tithe the Jewish proportion in systematic giving, be the source from which we shall draw our special vows.

II. IT IS A GOOD THING TO GIVE OUR INCREASING GRATITUDE SUCH SPECIAL OUTLETS. For after all, the Lord has given us everything, and may demand all if he pleases. When he is so "modest in his demands"—if we may be allowed such an expression regarding his claim upon the tithes—it is surely becoming in us from time to time to give our hearts free play, and have persons or things specially set apart for him.

III. BUT WE MUST NOT BE RASH OR INCONSIDERATE IN OUR VOWS. Jephthah, for example, was most rash in his vow. So was Saul in the war with the Philistines, when he almost insisted on Jonathan dying because, in eating a little honey in the wood, he had in ignorance transgressed the vow of the inconsiderate king. We have no right to make "rash promises" to any one, much less to God.

IV. WHEN WE HAVE REGISTERED A SPECIAL VOW WE MUST KEEP IT SCRUPULOUSLY. There is a temptation to make liberal vows on condition of receiving certain blessings from God, and then to forget them when the blessing is received. Let us take in illustration the case of Jacob. When he was posting in hot haste towards Padan-aram for fear of the injured Esau, he spent a remarkable night at Bethel. God there gave him a reassuring vision. Sin, he saw, had not separated him altogether from heaven, but even a deceiver like himself might return penitently to God and rise on the rounds of a ladder of light into fellowship and peace. In this ecstasy he registers in the calm morning light a vow: "If God will be with me, and will keep me in this way that I go, and will give me bread to eat, and raiment to put on, so that I come again to my father's house in peace; then shall the Lord be my God: and this stone, which I have set for a pillar, shall be God's house: and of all that thou shalt give me I will surely give the tenth unto thee" (Gen. xxviii. 20—22). Did Jacob keep his vow? Surely the moment he returns to Canaan he will make for Bethel, and set up his altar, and discharge his vow? Nothing of the kind. He forgot all about it, and went to Succoth, and then to Shechem, and it was not till Dinah had been defiled, and members of his family were becoming idolaters, and God commanded him to go to Bethel and perform it, that the wily old patriarch was brought to a sense of his duty (Gen. xxxv. 1—7).

Let us, then, enter upon our vows calmly, deliberately, without any unseemly haste. Then, whatever it may cost, no matter how great the sacrifice, let us undertake it, and our whole religious life will rise to the occasion. The future life, into which we hope to enter, will be so completely dedicated to God's glory, that the distinction we must needs now make between ordinary and special vows shall be lost completely, for the enthusiasm which leads to such special vows now shall make them the ordinary rule for ever.—R. M. E.

Vers. 1—25.—*Singular vows.* The loving heart will ask not only what *must*, but what *may*, be done; and the sacrifices offered in the flames of love are acceptable to God (2 Chron. vi. 8). These are the principles which underlie the laws concerning singular vows.

I. THE SINGULAR VOW LIES IN THE ELEMENT OF SEPARATION. 1. Hence the subject of the vow is styled a Nazarite. (1) From *m*, to separate, to consecrate (see Numb. vi.; Judg. xiii. 5; 1 Sam. i. 11, 28). (2) Probably the prayer of Jabez was of the nature of a singular vow (1 Chron. iv. 10). Paul seems to have taken upon himself such a vow (see Acts xviii. 18). 2. *Jesus was a Nazarite in spirit.* (1) He was not a Nazarite in the letter (Matt. xi. 19). What a rebuke is here to the uncharitableness of certain extreme advocates of total abstinence! (2) Yet in spirit was Jesus the Grand

Antitype of all those anciently separated to God. Hence his dwelling at Nazareth was in the order of providence, and in fulfilment of prophecy, viz. that he should be called a Nazarene (Matt. ii. 23). 3. *So are true Christians.* (1) The disciples of Jesus, who were first called "Christians" at Antioch, were also distinguished as "Nazarenes" (see Acts xi. 26; xxiv. 5). They do not appear to have refused either title. (2) Professors should strive to prove themselves worthy of both. All Christians, in their baptism and in their voluntary acceptance of Christ, are bound by sacred vows. (3) The true merit of our modern abstainers from intoxicants who are so for the glory of God, is that of the Nazarite.

II. THINGS MAY BE CONSECRATED AS WELL AS PERSONS. 1. *A beast might be the subject of a singular vow.* (1) The Law prescribes that should it be such as might be offered in sacrifice to God, it must not be exchanged (vers. 9, 10). The reason appears to be that in this case it must be looked upon as a type of Christ, and for him there can be no substitute. (2) But if unsuitable for sacrifice, then it becomes the priests'. In this case it became the subject of estimation, and from the value put upon it by the priest there is no appeal. This assumes that his valuation is just; and this certainly is true of his Great Antitype, who will be our Judge. 2. *A house may be the subject of a singular vow.* (1) By means of dedicated things the sanctuary came to be the depository of great treasure (1 Kings xv. 16). (2) The riches of the gospel are principally spiritual. The houses which enrich the Church are saintly families. 3. *A field might be the subject of a singular vow.* (1) The estimation of the land is by the quantity of seed sown in it, fifty shekels to the homer (ver. 16). But the estimation was modified with respect to the law of the jubilee. The values of all earthly things are influenced by their relation to things heavenly. (2) If the owner would redeem that he vowed to God, he must add a fifth to the estimated value. This was a general rule; and was instituted to discourage fickleness in relation to the service of God.—J. A. M.

Vers. 26—34.—*Devoted things.* The earlier part of this chapter is mainly concerned with things sanctified to God by vows.

I. DEVOTED THINGS DIFFER FROM THINGS SANCTIFIED. 1. *In that they may not be redeemed.* (1) Things sanctified might be redeemed. The laws of estimation proceeded upon the recognition of this principle. (2) But it is otherwise with things devoted (see vera. 6, 21, 28). They are in the category of things "most holy," which only may be touched by the priests. (3) Hence firstlings must not be sanctified (ver. 26). The reason is that they are already the property of God. They can neither be given to him nor redeemed from him. They were types of Christ, who is therefore called the "Firstfruits of every creature"—the Antitype of all the firstfruits. 2. *Persons when devoted were doomed to die.* (1) Such was the fate of the enemies of the Lord. The Canaanites as unfit to live were so devoted (see Exod. xxii. 19; Deut. xxv. 19; Josh. vi. 17; 1 Sam. xv. 3; 1 Kings xx. 42). (2) Here is no reference to human sacrifices, as some have imagined. It is a question of justice and judgment upon the wicked. (3) But by a rash vow the innocent may suffer. Thus through the adjuration of Saul Jonathan's life was imperilled (1 Sam. xiv.). Jephthah's vow compromised the life of his daughter (Judg. xi. 30, 31, 39). The reading in the margin (ver. 31) is preferable. Jephthah could not make a burnt offering of anything unsuited to that purpose, and whatever else came forth he vowed not to sanctify but to devote. (4) The severity of God upon those devoted for their wickedness should admonish sinners of the formidableness of his anger in the great day of his wrath.

II. THE LAW CONCERNING TITHES. 1. These are now formally required. (1) They were originally vowed to God (see Gen. xiv. 19; xxviii. 22). (2) The acts of the patriarchs bound their posterity. Hence Levi paid tithes to Melchizedek, being yet in the loins of Abraham (Heb. vii. 9, 10). (3) Therefore God now claims them (vers. 30, 32). (4) The spirit of this law is still binding upon the spiritual seed of Abraham (see 1 Cor. ix. 11; Gal. vi. 6). 2. *Things marked as tithes must not be exchanged.* (1) The expression, "passeth under the rod," is thus explained by the rabbins: "When a man was to give the tithe of his sheep or calves to God, he was to shut up the whole flock in one fold, in which there was one narrow door capable of letting out one at a time. The owner stood by the door with a rod in his hand, the end of which was

dipped in vermillion or red ochre. The mothers of those lambs or calves stood without, and as the young ones passed out, when the tenth came he touched it with the colour, and this was received as the legitimate tithe." (2) Here note the vicarious principle. When the tenth was taken, nine went free. Christ is our Tenth (see Isa. vi. 13). (3) The tenth must not be exchanged for better or worse. Providence is presumed to have guided the rod. While Christ becomes the Substitute for mankind, no one can take his place.—J. A. M.

Vers. 1—33.—*Spontaneous devotion.* The relations between God and his ancient people were not so rigid as they are sometimes supposed to have been. It was not all enactment on the one hand, and obedience or disobedience on the other. We find illustration here—

I. THAT THE LAW OF GOD LEAVES AMPLE ROOM FOR THE PLAY OF SPONTANEOUS DEVOTION. Under the inspiring influence of some signal mercies, individual or national, the Israelite might devote to God either (1) a person (ver. 2), or (2) an animal (ver. 9), or (3) a house (ver. 14), or (4) a piece of land (ver. 16). This was to be a singular vow (ver. 2), the dedication of something over and above that which was, by law, already appropriated to the service of Jehovah (see vers. 26, 30). It was and is the will of our God that special favours received at his hand, or special influences wrought by his Spirit in our heart, should be marked by optional and exceptional services on our part. We may, when thus animated by gratitude for his kindness, or penetrated with a sense of his goodness and grace, freely and spontaneously bring to the altar of our Lord (1) our possessions, (2) our time and labour, (3) our children (whom we may surrender to his service in distant and dangerous scenes), (4) any precious thing which we are not bound to give, but which we voluntarily and joyfully lay at his feet.

II. THAT THE FORM OF OUR DEVOTION MAY CHANGE SO LONG AS THE SPIRIT OF IT IS RETAINED. The Israelite who vowed a "person" redeemed the vow by presenting money according to a nicely graduated scale (vers. 3—8); or he might redeem a beast by paying money equal to its estimated value, together with one-fifth part added thereto (ver. 13); so with a piece of land (ver. 19). In a similar way, we may resolve and may undertake to give ourselves or our possessions to some particular sacred cause, and there may arise conditions which render it undesirable or even impossible for us to complete our work. In such case our Lord does not hold us to a mere literal fulfilment; what he looks for, and should certainly receive at our hands, is some equivalent in which we *at least as freely* express our gratitude and devotion. The essential thing is to preserve the spirit of our piety, and also to maintain a good measure of its most suitable expression, whatever that, at any time, may be.

III. THAT WE MAY GO SO FAR IN THE WAY OF DEDICATION THAT IT IS NOT PERMISSIBLE TO RETIRE. The Jew under the Law might, as we have seen, redeem certain things at a certain point; but there was a point at which everything was irredeemable. No "devoted thing" could be redeemed (vers. 28, 29). A beast "devoted to the Lord" must be offered up; an enemy once "devoted" must be put to death. When this point is reached in Christian consecration must be left to each Christian conscience. But we may contend that withdrawal is seldom, if ever, allowable when (1) there has been a solemn and formal dedication of person or substance in the presence of Christ and his people; (2) an overt action has been taken which commits other people, and when our retirement would involve theirs also; (3) such withdrawal would bring dishonour on the sacred Name we bear. Under such conditions as these we must proceed at all risks and costs, and having vowed, we must "pay unto the Lord our God" (Ps. lxvi. 11).—C.

Vers. 3—7.—*The distinctions which remain.* A pious Hebrew might, under a sense of gratitude, or in an hour of spiritual elevation, dedicate something dear to himself unto Jehovah. It might be a person, or an animal, or a field. If the first of these, he or she was to be redeemed, and a table was drawn according to which the redemption was to be made. In this scale, we find the extremes of life, age and infancy, valued at the least sum, youth at more, and prime at the most; we find also woman placed lower in the list than man. These distinctions in the estimated value of human life may remind us—

I. THAT IN THE GOSPEL OF CHRIST THERE ARE NO DISTINCTIONS IN RESPECT OF LEVITICUS.

**AGE, SEX, OR CLASS.** Age is not less welcome because it is old, nor youth because it is young, nor poverty because it is poor, nor wealth because it is rich, to the Saviour of souls. Woman stands on the same ground with man, and her love and service count for as much in the Lord's esteem as his. "In Christ Jesus there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female" (Gal. iii. 28). There is no respect of persons with the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

**II. THAT IN THE VALUE OF CHRISTIAN SERVICE SOME DISTINCTIONS MUST REMAIN.** The kind of service we render our Lord differs at different periods of our life. Obviously that of the little child is distinct from that of the man in the maturity of his strength. The scale of redemption under the Law, as given in this passage, suggests: 1. That age, though of declining value, has its tribute to bring (ver. 7); it can bring its purity, its calmness, its caution, its contentedness, its patient waiting: "planted in the house of the Lord, . . . we shall still bring forth fruit in old age" (Ps. xcii. 13, 14). 2. That prime has the largest offering to lay on the altar of the Lord (ver. 8). Manhood brings its strength, its maturity, its experience, its learning, its vigour. 3. That youth is of great account in the estimate of God (ver. 5); it can bring to the service of Christ its eagerness, its ardour, its faith, its devotedness. 4. That childhood has its figure also in the Divine reckoning (ver. 6); it can bring its innocence, its trustfulness, its docility, its winsomeness, its obedience. We are thus reminded that, while there is no stage in our life when we are not heartily welcome to our Saviour, there is at each period some special work we can do, some peculiar service we can render him, and we may add that every offering of every kind is acceptable to him if it be presented in humility and with a willing mind.—C.

**Ver. 34.—*The Law and the gospel.*** 1. It may be rightly said that true religion is essentially the same everywhere and at all times. Whithersoever and whensover we look, we shall find the same cardinal elements—the fear of God, the love of God, respect for our own spiritual nature, regard for the rights and claims of others, abstinence from that which is immoral, kindness and helpfulness, etc. 2. It may also be truly said that in the Law there was much more than many have supposed of those elements which are prominent in the gospel: more of spiritual freedom, of joy in God, of happy and sacred fellowship than we are apt to associate with "Mount Sinai," and "the commandments which the Lord commanded Moses." When, therefore, we draw a distinction between the Law and the gospel, it must be remembered that it is not without important qualifications; that the Law had, in most cases, an aspect which was essentially Christian; and that, similarly, the gospel in most cases has an aspect which is legal. With this in mind, we may draw the contrast—

**I. THAT THE LAW WAS PREPARATORY AND PROPHETIC;** the gospel is final and in fulfilment of that which had been anticipated. This, especially, in regard to sacrifice and offering.

**II. THAT THE LAW WAS PRECEPTIVE;** the gospel is suggestive. The one supplied a multitude of rules for the regulation of worship and of daily life, the other has few "commandments." Its positive precepts are small in number, but it lays down those principles and implants that spirit by which the right and the wrong course are suggested, to be pursued or shunned by the obedient heart.

**III. THAT THE LAW WAS PROHIBITIVE;** the gospel is inspiring. Not wholly, but strikingly, in each case. The Law continually said imperatively, "Thou shalt not;" the gospel says encouragingly, "Wilt not thou?" The Law interdicted very many things, and an Israelite was obedient very much according to his conscientious avoidance of that which was forbidden. The gospel incites to feelings, words, actions of goodness, wisdom, grace, helpfulness; and a Christian man is obedient and acceptable in proportion as he opens his heart to heavenly inspiration, and is stirred to be and do that which is noble and Christ-like.

**IV. THAT THE LAW MADE ITS APPEAL TO HUMAN FEAR;** the gospel to human love. Jehovah was, indeed, presented often to the Hebrew as his Redeemer from bondage; but, upon the whole, he was so revealed as, above everything, to strike the soul with profoundest reverence and awe. The Jew never ceased to hear the thunderings and see the lightnings of Sinai. The motto of the devout Israelite was this—"I fear God." In the gospel God is manifested in Jesus Christ, our Saviour, our Friend, our sympathizing

High Priest; and, while not without deepest reverence, we feel that “the love of God in Christ Jesus” is the spring and the strength of our devotion; it is the key to which the sacred music of our life is set.

V. THAT THE LAW HAD RESPECT TO EARTHLY LIFE; the gospel to the farthest future. The Law said, “Do this, and thou shalt live long in the land;” “do this, and the rains shall fall and the vines shall bear and the barns be full;” but the gospel says, “Do this—repent, believe, follow Christ; and while there shall be sufficiency of present food for present need, there shall be abounding grace in the heart, fruitfulness in the life, peace in death, and a long eternity of sinless service and unclouded joy in the presence of the King, in the home of God.—C.

Vers. 1—34.—*Vows and dues.* I. We find here a representation of the union of righteousness and grace in the kingdom of God. The sacredness of vows and dues; but the estimation, by the priest, according to the ability of him that made the vow. The Law makes its claim, but God provides against its rigour.

II. Comparison of the Law of God as given to his ancient people with the imperfect and cruel laws of merely human origin. Especially as to human sacrifices. The only human life which could be vowed to God was that which was already doomed by right of war or otherwise. The animal sacrifices, being strictly prescribed, excluded human sacrifice. The true religion is the only protection of human life. Those who profess enthusiasm of humanity, instead of and as a substitute for faith in Christ, have no security to offer that their inadequate theory of human obligation will extirpate cruelty and promote the happiness of the world.

III. The commutation of vows and dues pointed to the pitifulness of Jehovah, who, while upholding the inviolability of his Law, would yet provide for the weakness of man. “He knoweth our frame,” etc. These glimpses of love in the midst of the thunders of Sinai were the promises of a revelation of the Divine nature in which love should predominate—a new covenant, which should take up into itself all that was enduring and Divine in the old. Underneath all the regulations of Leviticus lies the original promise of redemption, and through all the veil of the Mosaic economy shines the Shechinah glory of God manifest in the flesh—the Prophet, Priest, and King, who came, not to destroy the Law, but to fulfil it, and in whom all the promises of God are Yea and Amen.—R.



## HOMILETICAL INDEX

TO

### THE BOOK OF LEVITICUS.

CHAPTER I.		CHAPTER III.	
THEME	PAGE	THEME	PAGE
The Sacrificial System	4	Honouring God with our Firstfruits...	28
The Burnt Offering...	5	Mediate and Immediate Presentation	29
Mediation ...	6	The Salt of the Covenant ...	30
Entire Consecration, as Illustrated in the Burnt Offering	6	The Offering of Daily Life	31
The Weakness of Man and the Grace of God	8	The <i>Minchah</i> , a Type of Christ	32
The Greatness of God	9	The Feast upon the <i>Minchah</i>	33
Our Reasonable Service	10	Notable Things ...	34
Sacrifice	12	The <i>Minchah</i> of the Firstfruits	35
The Burnt Sacrifice of the Herd	13	Our Recognition of the Hand of God in the Blessings of Life ...	36
The Burnt Offering of the Flock and of the Fowls	14	Purity in Worship	37
God in Special Manifestation	15	Priest and People : Reciprocal Services	38
The True End of Sacrifice—Entire Consecration to God	16	The Meat Offering	39
Principles of Spiritual Sacrifice	17	The Various Kinds of Meat Offerings	39
God's Pleasure in Man	18		
The Law of Burnt Offerings	19		
"Speak unto the children of Israel"	20		
The Burnt Sacrifice	21		
"And he shall put his hand upon the head," etc.	21		
The Killing, Flaying, and Consuming of the Victim	22		
The Offering from the Flocks	22		
The Offering of Fowls	23		
CHAPTER II.		CHAPTER IV.	
The Meat Offering	25	The Sin Offering ...	55, 67
Salt	26	Atonement for the Penitent, as Illustrated in the Sin Offering	55
Consecrated Life-work, as brought out in the Meat Offering	27	2 G	
LEVITICUS.			

THEME	PAGE	THEME	PAGE
Unintentional Transgression	57	Quench not the Spirit	91
Atonement for Involuntary Transgression	58	The Ever-burning Fire	93
Rites Essential to an Atonement	58	The Holiness of the Sin Offering	93
The Sin Offering for the Priest	59	The Law of the Burnt Offering	94
The Sin Offering Viewed as Typical of the Sacrifice of Calvary	60	The Law of the Meat Offering	95
Sin Offering for the Congregation	61	The Law of the Sin Offering	96
Sin Offering of the Ruler and of any of the People	63	Three Principles of Piety	97
The Mind of God respecting the Sin of Man	64	"Fellowship with the Father"	98
Gradations in Guilt	65	Communicated Sanctity	98
Collective Guilt Unconsciously Incurred	66	Ministerial Function and Obligation	99
Full Acceptance with God	66	Instructions on the Offerings for the Priests	99
Access for All: Comparison and Contrast	67	Meat Offering	100
The High Priest's Burnt Offering	70	Special Regulations as to the Sin Offering	100
The Whole Congregation Sinners through Ignorance	70	<b>CHAPTER VII.</b>	
A Ruler can Sin through Ignorance, and Requires Atonement	71	That which is itself Unclean Makes whatever it Touches Unclean also	102
The Sins of the Common People	71	Ministerial Support	103, 113
<b>CHAPTER V.</b>			
Confession of the Sin Committed	73	Fidelity to Precept Enforced	104
Guilt Removed	74	The Threefold Participation	105
The Trespass Offering	75, 80, 85	The Law of the Trespass Offering	106
Fidelity in Bearing Witness	76	The Peace Offering of Thanksgiving	107
Shunning the Impure	77	The Sanctity of the Service of God	108
Redeeming Promises	77	The Service of the Oblation	109
Pardon Possible to All	78	Emphatic Truths; or Things God Lays Stress upon	110
Cases of Concealment of Knowledge and Ceremonial Uncleanness	79	The Kingdom of God: Lessons from the Heave Offering	110
Restitution as Inculcated in the Trespass Offering	80	Four Thoughts on Sacred Service	111
Trespass Amended	82	Divine and Human Severity	112
Trespass in Sacrilege	82	Three Features of Acceptable Service	112
Restitution to God	83	The Peace Offerings and Thank Offerings	113
Unconscious Sin	84	Instructions for the People on the Fat and on the Blood	114
<b>CHAPTER VI.</b>			
Swearing Falsely...	86	The Wave Breast and the Heave Shoulder	114
Repentance, Confession, Satisfaction, Absolution	86	<b>CHAPTER VIII.</b>	
Dishonesty Atoned for	86	Priesthood	118
Restitution	87	Priestly Consecration	120
Human Ownership and Dishonesty	88	The Installation of Aaron	122
Sin a Germ as well as a Fruit	89	The High Priesthood of Christ	123
Trespasses done Wittingly	89	The Triple Offering	124
The Priests' Ritual	91	The Baptism of Aaron and his Sons	125
		The Holy Garments of Aaron	126
		Levitical Anointings	128
		The Vesting of the Priests and the Offerings for them	129
		The Ram of Consecration	130

THEME	PAGE	THEME	PAGE
A Time for Publicity ...	181	Instruction as well as Sacrifice ...	166
The Human and Divine Priesthood—		The Spirit of Obedience ...	167
Contrast ...	182	That which is Left to us ...	168
The Human and Divine Priesthood—		Ministers to be Examples of Purity ...	168
Comparison ...	182	<b>CHAPTER XI.</b>	
Spiritual Apparel ...	133	Meats Distinguished into Clean and Unclean	172, 176, 182, 183, 184
Equipment for Special Work ...	134	“Ye shall be holy; for I am holy”	173
The Burden of the Lord ...	135	The Religious Use of Nature ...	174
Public Inauguration of Divine Service	135	The Waters and their Inhabitants ...	177
“And Moses brought Aaron and his sons,” etc. ...	136	Flying Creatures ...	178
Aaron’s Drees ...	136	Unclean Creeping and, Dead Things	180
Anointing ...	136	The Abominable Thing ...	181
The Sacrifices of Consecration ...	137	Health a Duty as well as a Blessing	182
<b>CHAPTER IX.</b>			
Miraculous Confirmation of the New Polity ...	139	The Significance of Death ...	184
A Sign Expected and Received ...	140	Sacred Separation ...	185
The Glory of the Lord ...	141	High Reasons for Holiness ...	185
The Eighth Day ...	142	Holiness and its Requirements ...	186
Aaron’s First Priestly Services ...	143	Holiness ...	187
Appearing together before God ...	144	<b>CHAPTER XII.</b>	
Sacrifice for Sin ...	145	The Purification of the Church ...	190
The Priest at the Altar ...	146	Born in Sin ...	191
Holy Invocation ...	147	The Statutes on Maternity ...	193
The Manifested Presence ...	148	Woman under the Law and under the Gospel ...	194
God’s Glory Manifested in the Blessedness of His People ...	148	Ceremonial Purifications ...	195
<b>CHAPTER X.</b>			
The Sinfulness of Man Mars the Full Effect of the Good Purposes of God	150	<b>CHAPTER XIII.</b>	
Fire ...	151	Leprosy regarded as the Type of Sin	198
Increase of Privilege Involves Increase of Danger ...	151	The Extrusion of the Leper from the Camp is a Type of Excommunication from the Christian Church ...	199
Counterfeit Fire ...	152	The Diagnosis of Sin as Illustrated in the Leprosy ...	200
Submission in Bereavement ...	153	Leprosy ...	202
Disobedience Swiftly Punished ...	154	The Priest’s Adjudication ...	203
A Bereaved Parent ...	155	A Picture of Sin ...	204
Restrictions and Infirmities of Religious Service ...	156	The Chosen Type of Sin—	
Nadab and Abihu ...	156	(1) Its Individual Aspect	206
Sin and Penalty in Sacred Things ...	157	(2) Its Social Aspect	207
Strange Fire ...	158, 160	Conviction of Sin ...	208
Self-Restraint and Utterance ...	159	Affections of the Mind ...	208
That Priests are Teachers ...	162	The Right and Duty of Excommunication ...	209
Abstinence Enjoined ...	162	Purity of Garments ...	211
Sobriety in the Priesthood ...	163	Impure Surroundings ...	212
The Eating of the Holy Things ...	164	<b>CHAPTER XIV.</b>	
Moses and Aaron: an Allegory ...	165	The Cleansing of the Leper Represents the Absolution of the Sinner ...	216
Wine and Worship ...	166		

THEME	PAGE	THEME	PAGE
The Cleansing of Sin as Illustrated in the Cleansing of the Leper	218	Atoning Death	268
Restoration Suggestions	219	Sanctity of Animal Life	268
Readmission	220	The Sanctity of the Atoning Blood	269
Final Rites of Readmission	221	<b>CHAPTER XVIII.</b>	
Divine Considerateness	222	The Restraints thrown about Marriage by God's Law	276
Thorough Purification	223	Unworldliness	278
The Cleansing of the Leper— (1) Ceremonies outside the Camp	224	Abominable Doings	280
(2) Ceremony in the Tabernacle	225	Two Aspects of Sin	281
Uncleanness in Houses	228	Life in Obedience	281
Cleansing the Corrupt House	230	Impurity—its Extent and Source	282
Leprosy in a House	230	The Penalty of Sin	283
<b>CHAPTER XV.</b>			
The Figure of the "woman which was diseased with an issue of blood twelve years" ...	232	Obedience Enjoined	284
Secret Sins	233	Abominations Denounced	285
Uncleanness	234	<b>CHAPTER XIX.</b>	
Personal Purity	235	Morality has a Basis of its Own	290
<b>CHAPTER XVI.</b>			
Union and Communion with God	244	The Laws of Submission	291
The Annual Reiteration of the Purifi- cation made on the Day of Atono- ment ...	246	The Laws of Piety and of Faith	293
The Great Day of Atonement	246	The Law of Kindness	294
A Sabbath of Rest	248	Stealing is Forbidden by the Law of God and Man	294
The Climax of Sacrificial Worship	248	"Ye shall not swear by my Name falsely"	295
The High Priest on the Day of Atono- ment ...	250	Mingled Seed	297
The Sacrifices on the Day of Atono- ment ...	251	Respect for Old Age	298
The Day of Atonement	252, 254	Moral Commandments have a Double Sanction	298
A Solemn Ceremony	253	Religion and Superstition	298
The Peril of Privilege	256	"Honour to whom honour"	298
Type and Antitype— (1) The Priest	256	Considerateness	299
(2) The Offering	257	Integrity	300
The Great Anniversary—Sacred Sea- sons	258	Love—its Root and Fruit	301
The Imperfect Ritual and the All- sufficient Sacrifice	259	Aids to Purity	302
<b>CHAPTER XVII.</b>			
Sacrifice is not in Itself Enough	262	The Range of Sin and the Rule of God	302
The Eating of Blood Prohibited	264	Three Helps to Spiritual Progress	303
Grace before Meat	264	Social Morality	303
Statutes concerning Blood	265	Purity in Worship	305
One Place of Sacrifice	266	Kindliness	306
Features of Christian Service	267	Justice	307
<b>CHAPTER XX.</b>			
The Difference between the Religious and the Secular Law	312		
The Pursuit of Knowledge by Right Means	313		
"Ye shall be holy unto me"	313		

## INDEX.

THEME	PAGE	THEME	PAGE
Human Sacrifices ...	314	Provision and Piety ...	364
Sin at its Worst ...	315	Piety in Prosperity ...	365
Credulity and Faith ...	316	The Summons of God ...	365
Sanctity — Demand, Inducement, Promise ...	317	Joy before the Lord ...	366
The Unforgiven ...	317	The Festivals ...	367
God's Displeasure with Ourselves ...	318	The Passover and Feast of Unleavened Bread ...	367
Three Aspects of Human Life ...	319	The First Sheaf a Wave Offering of the Harvest ...	367
Sin unto Death ...	320	The Day of Pentecost ...	368
Punishments Assigned to Presumptuous Sins ...	321	Religious Festivals ...	368
<b>CHAPTER XXI.</b>			
The Marriage of the Clergy ...	323	<b>CHAPTER XXIV.</b>	
Priestly Qualifications ...	323	Everlasting Light ...	374
Law of Holiness for the Priests ...	325	The Weekly Offering ...	375
Distinctions and Degrees in Obligation	325	The Lighting of the Sanctuary ...	376
Unblemished Service ...	326	The Bread of the Presence ...	377, 380
The Perfection of the Priesthood ...	327	Ourselves as Lights ...	378
<b>CHAPTER XXII.</b>			
The Perfection Demanded in the Sacrificial Victims ...	330	The Lesson of the Loaves ...	379
Holiness of Priests and Sacrifices ...	330	The Lights in the Sanctuary ...	380
Priestly Disqualifications ...	331	The Candlestick ...	380
The Service of Abstention ...	332	The Shewbread ...	382
The Guilt of Profanation ...	332	The Crime of Blasphemy ...	386
Characteristics of Acceptable Service	333	Public Justice Secured by the Law of Retaliation ...	387
The Culture of Kindness ...	334	Shelomith's Son ...	388
The Eating of the Holy Things ...	334	A Suggestive Episode ...	389
Laws of the Oblations ...	335	The Holy Law of God ...	390
<b>CHAPTER XXIII.</b>			
The Paschal Supper Observed by our Lord ...	341	A Blasphemer Punished ...	391
The Offering of Rest: The Sabbath	343	The Law of Death ...	392
The Sabbath ...	344	<b>CHAPTER XXV.</b>	
Aspects of the Sabbath ...	345	The Power of Slavery ...	396
The Harvest Festivals ...	349	The Fallow Year ...	397
The Passover ...	350, 356	The Jubilee ...	399, 402
The Feast of the Firstfruits ...	351	The Sabbatic Year ...	400, 407, 403
The Pentecost ...	352	Redemption ...	403
The Feast of Trumpets ...	353, 360, 368	Justice and Mercy ...	404
The Annual Repentance—the Day of Atonement ...	354	Divine Discipline ...	405
The Pilgrim Spirit as Illustrated in the Feast of Tabernacles ...	355	Year of Jubilee— (1) A Nation's Joy ...	405, 407
The Feast of Harvest ...	357	(2) The World's Redemption ...	406
The Hebdomad ...	359	(3) The Blessed Kingdom ...	407
The Feast of Expiation ...	361	The Law of Personal Servitude ...	408
The Feast of Tabernacles ...	362, 368, 371	Servants of God ...	409
The Influence of Sacred Recollections	363	<b>CHAPTER XXVI.</b>	
		Promises and Threatenings ...	414
		Temporal Rewards and Punishments	415
		The Blessedness of the Righteous ...	417
		Prophetic Maledictions ...	418

THEME	PAGE	THEME	PAGE
Hope for Israel ... ...	419	The Gracious Invitation to Repentance ... ...	427
Idolatry: Our Danger and our Security	419	<b>CHAPTER XXVII.</b>	
Incentives to Obedience ... ...	420	Vows ... ...	429
Our God and Ourselves ... ...	421	Keeping Vows ... ...	430
Divine Retribution ... ...	422	Singular Vows ... ...	431
Sorrow unto Salvation ... ...	423	Devoted Things ... ...	432
Obedience and Prosperity ... ...	424	Spontaneous Devotion ... ...	433
God Dwelling amongst Men ...	425	The Distinctions which Remain ...	433
Command to Maintain the Public		The Law and the Gospel ...	434
Worship of Jehovah ... ...	426	Vows and Dues ... ...	435
Promises and Threatenings ...	426		
Threatenings ... ...	427		





*In course of publication, Super-Royal 8vo.*

# THE PULPIT COMMENTARY.

Edited by the Rev. Canon H. D. M. SPENCE, M.A.,

Vicar and Rural Dean of St. Pancras, and Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol; and

By the Rev. JOSEPH S. EXELL, Editor of "The Homiletic Quarterly,"

## WITH INTRODUCTIONS

By the Rev. Canon F. W. FARRAR, D.D., the Right Rev. BISHOP OF EDINBURGH, the Very Rev. Principal TULLOCH, D.D., the Rev. Canon G. RAWLINSON, M.A., and the Rev. Professor A. PLUMMER, M.A.; and

## *HOMILIES AND EXPOSITIONS BY UPWARDS OF SEVENTY CONTRIBUTORS.*

---

The aim of THE PULPIT COMMENTARY is to provide scholarly Introductions to the sacred books; to divide the text of Scripture into paragraphs, and to supply each paragraph with such Exposition as shall meet the wants of the Student, and such Homiletical suggestions as shall assist the preparations of the Preacher.

The EXPOSITIONS give Textual Criticism, Revised Translation where necessary, Explanation, Apologetics, Reference to Ancient Customs, Contemporary History, Natural History, Geographical Research, Science, and anything that tends to light up the Text, and make it available for practical instruction. These are followed by a comprehensive SERMON OUTLINE, embracing the salient points of the preceding critical and expository section, and by brief HOMILIES FROM VARIOUS CONTRIBUTORS, designed to show different modes of treatment, and to bring into relief different aspects of the passages under consideration.

---

### *THE FOLLOWING VOLUMES ARE NOW READY:—*

## GENESIS.

By Rev. T. WHITELAW, M.A.; with Homilies by Very Rev. J. F. MONTGOMERY, D.D., Rev. Prof. R. A. REDFORD, M.A., LL.B., Rev. F. HASTINGS, and Rev. W. ROBERTS, M.A. An Introduction to the Study of the Old Testament by Rev. Canon FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S.; and Introductions to the Pentateuch by The Right Rev. H. COTTERILL, D.D., and Rev. T. WHITELAW, M.A. (*Fourth Edition.*) Price 15s.

---

### *OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.*

"It is quite impossible, in the limits of a brief notice, to review and characterize these ponderous volumes as they deserve. But I may say at once that the expositions contained in them, especially considering that they are meant for popular use, maintain a very high level. From the strictly orthodox point of view, I doubt, for instance, whether any better commentary on the Book of Genesis has been written than that of Mr. Whitelaw, or has been written in a better spirit."—*The Expositor.*

"We are bound to say that the more we see of this Commentary the better we like it; and the more highly do we estimate the ability, piety, and sound judgment with which it is being carried on. Most readers will feel that they understand far better the plan and purpose of the entire Commentary after an attentive perusal of the volume upon Genesis; and it would not be too much to say that, take it altogether, there is no other Commentary upon Genesis in the English language quite equal to it. Fuller and more comprehensive than either Bishop Wordsworth's, J. H. Blunt's, or the 'Speaker's'

Commentary, it yet avoids the prolixity, the faults of style, the somewhat pedantic and over-learned disquisitions of Lange's 'Bibel-werk,' which it sometimes tasks even a scholar to disentangle; while its comments are, in all respects, adequate and learned, and wherever we have tested them pious and orthodox."—*The Literary Churchman.*

"The Introductions of the volume on Genesis are specially able and complete. Canon Farrar contributes a General Introduction to the Old Testament—setting forth the way in which for homiletical purposes it is to be interpreted and used—full of scholarly and commonsense canons and suggestions; Bishop Cotterill an elaborate dissertation on the development of the idea of law, from its beginning in human consciousness to its culmination in the revelation of God; Mr. Whitelaw a defence of the Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch, dealing in detail with objections. Mr. Whitelaw is also the author of the Exposition of Genesis and of its Homiletics. The Homilies are by Dr. Montgomery,

Professor Redford, Rev. W. Roberts, and Rev. F. Hastings. The volume is throughout a very able and important exposition of this first and seminal book of the Bible."—*British Quarterly Review*.

"We do not, of course, commit ourselves to all the positions of this massive introduction, nor indeed to the exegetical conclusions without exception of the rest of the volume, but that does not prevent our saying with reference to the 'Pulpit Commentary' on Genesis that there is nothing like it, and that no one who wishes to be thoroughly informed on this precious portion of Holy Writ can afford to be without it."—*Methodist*.

"In the two volumes before us we have the plan of the 'pulpit' Commentary sufficiently matured to enable us to judge of its value. Each chapter in the Commentary is examined mostly verse by verse, and the light accumulated by modern discoveries, and, let us add, by modern controversies, is used to clear up the meaning of the text. This is succeeded by homiletic reflections in which the chapter is examined in a broader sweep, and the lessons which may fairly and reasonably be deduced from the Scriptural narrative are stated in such a manner as to make them useful as outlines of sermons, or at least as suggestive of the ruling thoughts which would rise in the minds of hearers, and demand a recognition in any exposition of the chapter. Such a design faithfully adhered to and carried out with a largeness of view, limited only by the plain and settled meaning of the text, will place in the hands of those called upon to expound the Scriptures of truth a selection of materials of unfailing value, and ready for constant use."—*John Bull*.

"The commentary by Mr. Whitelaw is done with very great thoroughness."—*Leeds Mercury*.

"The commentaries of to-day represent not only industry but research; they are laborious as well as wide. The one before us is not only laborious but original. It is, in fact, three commentaries in one."—*Liverpool Albion*.

"There are two points to be specially noted in this work. One is that it is brought out under the auspices of clergymen and Dissenting ministers working together in its production; the other is that it is a gigantic magazine of materials prepared for being promptly made up into sermons."—*Guardian*.

"We repeat emphatically the high encomium which we have passed upon former volumes of 'The Pulpit Commentary.' This is a grand book."—Rev. C. H. SPURGEON in *Sword and Trowel*.

"We have done all this conscientiously, and the result of our inspection lays it on us as a simple duty to say that, amongst all the commentaries which it might occur to the reader to compare with this one (and those are such as Lange's), this amongst them all is the best 'Genesis' for homiletical purposes that we have. And let it be remarked that this 'Genesis' will be found to serve these purposes in a manner much more learned and scholarly than the ordinary homilist will likely or can reasonably expect. . . . The Exposition of Genesis, for which Mr. Whitelaw is also responsible, is, as we have said already, a very able and scholarly performance. The expositor is obviously a true exegete. There is a true exegetical impulse and tact in extracting the meaning out of the language of the sacred writer instead of transposing the mind of the interpreter into it. There is great care and caution and a fine balancing of reasons and mature and safe judgment maintained in dealing with controverted and difficult passages. The summation of objections to the rejected interpretation, and of grounds of preference for the adopted one is masterly, and such as makes the points easy, both of understanding and of remembrance. . . . The scientific borderlands of theology, so often lifted into view in the first chapters of Genesis, are carefully surveyed, and very safely laid off. Mr. Whitelaw has mastered the scientific information and principles necessary for this in a way too seldom repeated. He proceeds with full, conscious deliberateness on the indispensable rule of avoiding both unnecessary collision and premature attempts at harmony between the revelations of nature and of Scripture. The Word of God is not staked rashly on human inter-

pretations. Altogether, the exposition is one of great practical avail, extremely satisfactory, we should think, to the scholar, and of the utmost utility, at the same time, for the pulpit—a utility greatly enhanced by the 'Homiletics' that is, homiletical analyses of these successive paragraphs. These 'Homiletics' are, while keeping to their proper office of analysing the text and breaking it up for preaching purposes, the freshest and most suggestive pulpit material we have seen."—*Edinburgh Daily Review*.

"In fact, these expositions are a new testimony that science and revelation are simply two revolving wheels with indentations intended from the very first to fit into each other, and neither of which has anything to fear, the only thing sure to suffer being the mistaken, because premature, interpretations thrust in between. The whole book reminds us very much of Lange, although the great German commentator has none of those homiletical outlines which are fitted to be of such service in these busy days to the self-reliant preacher who knows how to use them, namely, not to stifle but to suggest thought. In another important sense the Commentary differs from Lange even in its best English attire, as well as from the series of commentaries of the old Puritan divines published by Nichol, of Edinburgh; we mean in this, that it is not overloaded, and that you can get at once what you need. This is a great boon, saving both time and temper, while every word tells. As a book specially intended for ministers of religion, as the title indicates, this Commentary will pass, when completed, into the front rank of Biblical expositions in the English or indeed in any other language."—*Liverpool Mercury*.

"The Exposition is wholly by Mr. Whitelaw, and is carefully and ably done. He has evidently spared no pains to make clear the meaning of the sacred narrative. He has had the best commentaries constantly by him, but he has not been a mere compiler or their slavish follower. While giving the views which others have held, which is most useful for the student, he is careful to give his own. His has been an independent study, but it is the independent study of one who knows how to use the labours of others in the same field. The early chapters of Genesis, from the alleged conflict between their teaching and that of science on the subject of the Creation, are the most difficult to an expositor. It would be affirming too much to say that Mr. Whitelaw fully disposes of all difficulties; but it may be asserted that his Exposition will be found in the main to be as satisfactory as any which has been given. He has not dealt with this portion of Genesis without having read widely what geologists, as well as Biblical critics, have written upon it. But able and excellent as his Exposition is throughout, yet we are inclined to rate his Homilies higher. We have made a pretty extensive examination of these, and have found them all admirable. The divisions are logical, the heads are briefly and pointedly stated, and the indication of their treatment is full of relevant matter. In his hands the richness of Scripture history, in the material which it furnishes for pulpit instruction, is well brought out."—*North British Daily Mail*.

"The main labour of the volume appears to have rested with Mr. Whitelaw, who has certainly done it in a most careful and workmanlike way. In ordinary circumstances it would be folly to expect of a writer who says at once the diverse tasks of critic, exegete, and homilist, that he should be successful in all three; but Mr. Whitelaw may fairly claim to have achieved that distinction. His Commentary is a production of great learning, and for working purposes will be found invaluable. It will bear comparison with any in the language in the fulness with which it exhibits not only the writer's own view, with the reasons on which it is grounded, but almost every opinion and shade of opinion which has ever been held by others and written down in books; as also in the frankness of its treatment of scientific, historical, and chronological difficulties. If the student whose mind is exercised with these difficulties happens to differ from the commentator, he cannot, at least, complain that the materials are withheld from him for framing a sounder judgment."—*Glasgow Herald*.

"We look forward with interest to the continuance of this bold undertaking, and hope to see it brought to a successful conclusion."—*Church Times*.

## NUMBERS.

By Rev. R. WINTERBOTHAM, M.A., LL.B., B.Sc.; with an introduction by Rev. T. WHITELAW, M.A.; and with Homilies by Rev. Prof. W. BINNIE, D.D., Rev. E. S. PROUT, M.A., Rev. D. YOUNG, B.A., and Rev. J. WAITE, B.A. (*Third Edition.*) Price 15s.

### OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

"Competent scholarship, exact thought, and reverent handling of the Scriptures are apparent on every page. He has mastered the voluminous literature which has gathered round this special book of Scripture, and is acquainted at first hand with all the critical, historical, and geographical problem, which await solution."—*Daily Free Press.*

"Of course, it would have been impossible to read carefully the whole of these five hundred closely printed large octavo pages, and it may be there are some opinions in it from which we might dissent; but judging from what we have read, we can confidently recommend it. Whilst it may be inferior in scholarship to the great works of Keil and Delitzsch, Ewald, Kurtz, and Hengstenberg, it will be found more useful than those, not only generally, but also for its special purpose. It may be confidently asserted that when completed the 'Pulpit Commentary' will be the best purely English commentary in existence. It divides the book into short paragraphs, of each of which there is a good exposition. The homiletic outlines follow, which may be used or read as a substitute for sermons. Then come homilies or sermon outlines on the same paragraphs by Rev. Prof. W. Binnie, D.D., Rev. E. S. Prout, M.A., Rev. D. Young, B.A., and Rev. J. Waite, B.A. In different parts of the work there are special articles—for instance, on the position of Kadesh, the thirty-eight years' submergence of the history after the rebellion at Kadesh, the history of Balaam, Balaam's prophecies, the zeal of Phinehas, the extermination of the Midianites, and the two lists of stations between Egypt and the Jordan. A homiletical index at the end of the volume adds greatly to its value."—*Leeds Mercury.*

"As the book of Numbers has never yet been fully expounded, we all the more heartily welcome this volume. If by any good word of ours we could increase the sale of this noble series of commentaries, we should count the time and space to be most profitably employed. Messrs. C. Kegan Paul and Co. deserve to be supported abundantly in an enterprise so daringly planned and so

admirably executed. Perhaps the best service we can render both to our readers and the publishers is to quote from the prospectus the following statement as to the design of these volumes, upon which the best scholars of the age are employed."—Rev. C. H. SPURGEON, in *Sword and Trowel.*

"The great difficulties created by the gaps of time in the book of Numbers, by the slaughter of the Midianitish women, the perplexities created by Kuenen and Colenso with reference to the two censuses, and the number of fighting men in the camp of Israel, are handled by Mr. Whitelaw very judiciously and ably, and the textual commentary by Mr. Winterbotham, with its special notes, does not shirk difficulties which have been often felt. Some very happy homiletic use is made of the grander portions of the sublime story."—*Evangelical Magazine.*

"The wisdom of the editors has in no instance been more clearly exhibited than in the selection of Mr. Winterbotham as expositor and homilist; and we are glad to meet him on ground where his exegetical powers are tested to the utmost. His colleagues, too, bear names which guarantee ability and soundness. The difficulties of the book are dealt with mainly in two elaborate introductions; one by Mr. Whitelaw, whose valuable contribution on Genesis we have already reviewed; and one by Mr. Winterbotham. Of the former it is impossible to speak too highly. The questions raised by the thirty-seven years' chasm, the number of fighting men, and of the congregation, the duties of the priest, the marshalling of the host, the Midianitish victory, etc., are handled in the clearest and most satisfactory manner. We have only one exception to make to Mr. Winterbotham's introduction, and that is that he sets too little store on the external evidence in favour of the book. Otherwise it is scholarly, philosophical, and sound. With regard to the so-called barren details of the book, we have seldom read anything more interesting and suggestive than the manner in which some of them are dealt with."—*Methodist.*

## JOSHUA.

By Rev. J. J. LIAS, M.A.; with introduction to the Historical Books by Rev. A. PLUMMER, M.A.; and with Homilies by Rev. E. DE PRESSENSE, D.D., Rev. R. GLOVER, Rev. J. WAITE, B.A., Rev. S. R. ALDRIDGE, B.A., Rev. W. F. ADENEY, M.A. (*Third Edition.*) Price 12s. 6d.

### OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

"Joshua is treated by Rev. J. J. Lias, and his entire work is fully deserving of similar praise. . . . But of publications of our own day, the work before us must easily bear away the palm for method and comprehensiveness. There has been nothing like it for the methodical way in which the whole surface of the Holy Scriptures has been treated with a homiletical intention, and we must say also in the general power

and ability with which the work is done. The volumes are of a goodly size and length, for it is hardly possible to compress the work very greatly; so that we fear the completed work must be a lengthy one. It appears to be conceived and carried on in a thoroughly fair and candid spirit, though not entirely by Churchmen; and the names of the various writers (each of them men of eminence in their several positions) speak for them-

selves. . . . All that learning, much industry, and an excellent method can do has been done to produce a work in which the laborious preacher may find the exact information for suggestive thought or careful generalization which he needs for his pulpit work, ready to his hand. And this is no small praise."—*Ecclesiastical Gazette*.

"No commentary worthy of the sacred text of Joshua has appeared in an English dress till the publication of the present volume. Keil is hardly up to his usual mark. Fay, in Lange, is far below even the average of that unequal work; even Calvin's masculine intellect seems at fault here, and Mr. Espin, in the 'Speaker's Commentary,' while reasonably full and sound on the whole, hardly reaches a high standard of excellence. We have examined this volume with much care, and have no hesitation in pronouncing it immeasurably the best interpretation of Joshua in the language. Mr. Lias, in addition to having the whole existing literature on the subject to work upon, has brought to his task critical and exegetical powers of a rare order, and the industry, judgment and literary skill of the late learned Hebrew professor at Lampeter, have produced a commentary which will be the standard work for this and the next generation."—*Methodist*.

"The Commentary on Joshua by Mr. Lias is as scholarly, painstaking, and effective as his contributions to the Cambridge Bible for schools, which have been characterized in these pages more than once."—*Expositor*.

"Turning to the Commentary itself, we must express unmixed satisfaction with the opening excursus of Principal Plummer, in which, while showing his thorough familiarity with the objections of Ewald, Dr. Davidson, and others, to the narrative of Joshua, he exposes their unduly dogmatic tone, and gives abundant evidence for accepting the authenticity of the book itself and preserving it in the canon of Scripture. . . . As a specimen of the expository part of this book, we may refer to the annotations on the Cities of Refuge, which contain some excellent thinking in small space, in addition to which it may be said that the fairness in relation to real difficulties conspicuous throughout cannot be better illustrated than in the exegesis on the crucial passage about the sun and the moon standing still in the valley of Ajalon. . . . 'The Pulpit Commentary,' when completed, must take its place supreme and without a rival

among all the expositions of the Sacred Scriptures published in our language."—*Liverpool Mercury*.

"As several volumes of the 'Pulpit Commentary' have already reached a third or fourth edition, their value appears to be understood and appreciated. The present volume opens with an introduction to the historical books from Joshua to Nehemiah, by the Rev. A. Plummer, Master of University College, Durham. Although there is nothing specially original in this introduction, the materials of previous investigations and criticisms are well arranged and grouped; and the whole affords a concise yet graphic account of the history of Israel during the time referred to. The special introduction to the Book of Joshua, from the pen of the Rev. J. J. Lias, late Hebrew Lecturer at Lampeter College, ably deals with the various critical questions involved; vindicates the integrity and early authorship of the book; and discusses with candour and clearness the so-called moral and miraculous difficulties which it presents. Mr. Lias also supplies the Exposition and Homilies in a series of concise and condensed notes, which presents the latest results of scholarship. The Homilies are by Dr. E. de Pressense, and the Revs. R. Glover, J. Waite, W. F. Adeney, and S. R. Aldridge; and, while very various in character, are valuable and suggestive. The volume throughout is a useful help to the homiletical student of the Book of Joshua."—*Leeds Mercury*.

"Whilst noticing Mr. Plummer's portion of the volume, we would call attention to some brief remarks at the end of the general introduction on the place which the historical books of the Old Testament are fitted to occupy in pulpit ministrations. These remarks are suggestive, and will prove valuable to the preacher. The exegetical parts of the volume are done with extreme care; and Professor Lias, to whom we are indebted for this part of the book, deserves praise for the industry with which he has collected the materials to illustrate this portion of the 'Pulpit Commentary.' The homiletic applications are from the pens of various writers, and are of different degrees of merit. They, however, are almost all of practical value—some, indeed, of great value—the germs of many a future sermon, we trust."—*John Bull*.

"We repeat with even fuller emphasis the opinion we expressed in noticing previous volumes of the 'Commentary,' that it stands first in its own department."—*British and Foreign Evangelical Review*.

## JUDGES AND RUTH.

By the Right Rev. Lord A. C. HERVEY, D.D., and Rev. J. MORISON, D.D.; with Homilies by Rev. Prof. J. R. THOMSON, M.A., Rev. W. M. STATHAM, Rev. A. F. MUIR, M.A., and Rev. W. F. ADENEY, M.A. (*Third Edition.*) Price 10s. 6d.

### OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

"The introduction, as well as the commentary, is vigorous and suggestive."—*British Quarterly Review*.

"The Book of Judges has been entrusted to Lord Arthur Hervey, Bishop of Bath and Wells, for 'exposition and homiletics,' and is well and thoroughly done, as would be expected from a divine who has made that portion of Scripture to some extent his special study."—*Ecclesiastical Gazette*.

"Another volume of this valuable Bible commentary deserves to be warmly welcomed. The exposition of the Book of Judges, by the Bishop of Bath and Wells, is full of solid learning and practical truth suited to all classes of readers, while the homiletical portion has many features to recommend it to ministers of religion. . . . Too much commendation cannot be bestowed on the commentary on Ruth by the Rev. Dr. Morison, of

Glasgow, the founder of one of the smaller denominations of Scotland, and a scholar of undoubted ability, as his volume on the eighth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans abundantly shows. We have no hesitation in pronouncing this the best exposition of the charming idyll of Ruth to be found in the English language. It is not surpassed by the volume of the same name in Lange's series, written by one of the great divines of Germany; while the homilies of Professor Thomson and the Rev. W. M. Statham largely increase its worth for practical purposes. If this commentary continues as it has begun, it will be without a rival in this or any other country, for giving biblical students an accurate knowledge of the original text, together with the latest results of investigation in the lands of the Bible themselves. The publishers have done wisely in putting these expositions into the hands of interpreters of the highest reputation, and from the favour with which their enter-

prise has been already received, they must be satisfied that public opinion has confirmed their judgment. This volume itself is a monument of patient and most persevering research, as those who know anything of the labour involved will see at a glance. It would be a wise investment on the part of congregations to place the book in every minister's library."—*Liverpool Mercury*.

"In the volume before us we have, too, the work of a scholar who has made this part of Scripture his peculiar study. The Bishop of Bath and Wells speaks, therefore, with the confidence of one who is familiar with his subject; and his notes and 'homiletics' can hardly fail to be of great use to the preacher, wherever he may consult them. . . . The commentary on Ruth is itself as good and edifying, and the entire volume quite equal to those which have preceded it."—*Church Quarterly Review*.

"The commentary must by this time be so well known to our readers that we need not repeat our former explanation of its character and aim. Suffice it to say that so far as it has yet appeared we have no hesitation in pronouncing it the best commentary for preachers we have yet seen, and that the volume before us, while less bulky than its predecessors, is upon the whole equal to them in point of merit."—*Literary World*.

"No clergyman ought to complain of the difficulty of pulpit preparation with such a work in his hands; the danger is rather lest the business of preaching be rendered too easy, and the preacher himself robbed of his independence. Looking over this volume, however, we do not see that there is much fear for this result; the homiletical notes are more suggestive (as it is so desirable that they should) than exhaustive. The reader will find no sermon complete and to his hand, but he will find what it is intended he should find, *homiletic notes*, to be worked up in the laboratory of his mind, and put into shape for the pulpit by dint of arrangement and thought on his part. We have been careful to examine into the treatment which some of the more difficult passages in the 'Judges' have received at the hands of the commentators, and find it eminently satisfactory. For example, Mr. Adeney's note, the murder of Sisera by Jael, is to be commended for its good sense and reasonableness. Nothing is said that shocks the moral sensibilities. The note on Jephthah's vow is also good."—*Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette*.

"The exposition of Judges, while able and well informed, furnishing nearly all that a student can want, strikes us as a little lacking in vigour. On the other hand, Lord Hervey's introduction, discussing questions of sources, date, chronology, etc., is admirably and con-

cisely written, and states views which by their caution and conspicuous good sense will probably commend themselves to most minds as satisfactory. No complaint on the score of vigour can be made to Dr. Morison's treatment of Ruth. Introduction and commentary alike are in his best style, and constitute a valuable addition to the literature of this charming book. The homiletical parts are able, and extract from the histories most of the lessons and applications they are capable of yielding. The knotty places in the narrative—Jael's treachery, the exploits of Samson, Jephthah's vow—are handled with care and judgment, and from independent standpoints. Most preachers shrink from continuous exposition of the Book of Judges, but for those who are inclined to attempt the task this volume affords abundance of suggestive help."—*Glasgow Herald*.

"Homilies full of suggestive thought."—*Nonconformist*.

"Of 'The Pulpit Commentary,' edited by Canon Spence and the Rev. Joseph Exell, an equally satisfactory account may most conscientiously be given. The volumes are got up in the same handsome style; authors eminent for ability and piety furnish the material; and the homiletical object is kept constantly in view. When this undertaking was begun, one feared lest it should be somewhat fragmentary and crude; but we are bound to say that the best means have been taken to make it a thorough and trustworthy work. Mr. Exell deserves credit for his services in the cause. He has helped greatly to raise Homiletics to the rank of a branch of theological science; and his endeavour to maintain homiletics in vital connection with her twin-sister, Exegesis, is much to be commended. It is the homiletical element that distinguishes the commentary, and by which it is to be judged. That element is singularly rich and full, and it gives one a remarkable impression of the manifoldness of Bible-teaching, even in the historical books."—*Catholic Presbyterian*.

"In the same volume there is a brief exposition of the Book of Ruth, by Dr. James Morison, which is, to my mind, the gem of the whole collection."—*Expositor*.

"It is unnecessary to speak in detail of the fulness and excellence of this exhaustive commentary, a library in itself, and which every clergyman's library ought to possess. . . . With this commentary in his library, the clergyman is almost free from the necessity of obtaining any other."—*Clergyman's Magazine*.

"The story of Ruth is brought out with fine tact and ample learning, and Mr. Statham's and Mr. Thomson's homilies are very vigorous, and to the point."—*Evangelical Magazine*.

## FIRST BOOK OF SAMUEL.

By Very Rev. R. PAYNE SMITH, D.D. (Dean of Canterbury); with Homilies by Rev. D. FRASER, D.D., Rev. Prof. CHAPMAN, M.A., and Rev. BRYAN DALE, M.A. (Fourth Edition.) Price 15s.

### OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

"The Dean of Canterbury's Commentary on 1 Samuel is, as those who know him, and his course of study would expect, quite the best help to the reading of that attractive book to be found in English literature."—*Expositor*.

"I thank you much for the large and handsome volume on 1 Samuel which you have kindly sent me. I have examined it in a few places, and feel sure that, in its special character of a homiletical commentary, it will prove of the greatest use to students of Holy Scripture."—The Right Rev. C. J. ELLICOTT, D.D., Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol.

"Another of those volumes of the 'Pulpit Commentary,' which are doubtless of lasting use to clergy-

men, has been added to the growing series edited by the Rev. Canon Spence and the Rev. Joseph Exell. The present work, which deals with the First Book of Samuel, follows the excellent plan upon which the preceding volumes have been designed. First, an introduction is given, in the same scholarly tone which characterized this part of each former work; and then follow expositions, a comprehensive sermon outline, and homilies by various authors."—*Daily Telegraph*.

"This new volume of 'The Pulpit Commentary' amply confirms the high opinion which we were led to form of its predecessor. Under the careful editorship of Canon Spence and the Rev. Mr. Exell, the exegetical and homiletic departments have been placed

in the hands of such capable men as Dr. Payne Smith, and Dr. Donald Fraser, who have produced what we may safely pronounce to be the best Commentary which has yet appeared in the English language on the First Book of Samuel."—*Edinburgh Daily Review*.

"We have thus endeavoured to give some slight idea of the plan of the work. There is nothing like it in the language. It is a mine of wealth for the preacher to dig in, and no one can fail to derive much that is valuable and excellent from it. To attempt to criticise the work in detail is manifestly impossible. We can only counsel all readers to possess themselves of it, for if further commendation is wanted, it may be found in the illustration hereby afforded to the proverbial saying that 'nothing succeeds like success.' The first volume of the 'Pulpit Commentary' that was published only a few months ago is already in its third edition, and a second edition of the present volume which is but just out has already been called for. It is obvious, therefore, that the work supplies a felt want, and that the public accordingly will have it."—*STANLEY LEATHES, D.D., Prof. of Hebrew, King's College, London.*

"There was ample room for a comment upon Samuel, for there is scarcely anything upon that book worth mentioning. This noble volume fills the gap exceedingly well, and will be invaluable to all ministers."—*Rev. C. H. SPURGEON in Sword and Trowel.*

"So far as we have been able to examine the volume, the exposition seems thoroughly sound, sober, and clear; the homiletical sections are rich in good thoughts; and the homilies, or outlines of sermons, considerably above the average of productions of the kind which have come under our notice. The undertaking shows no sign of deterioration. The amount of matter compressed into the volume—573 pages large octavo, and closely printed—is simply enormous, and the price amazingly low. A good feature of the work is the homiletical index of subjects as they occur in the successive chapters."—*Leeds Mercury.*

"The Pulpit Commentary' differs from Lange's great work in avoiding the endless accumulation of divergent interpretations, and the comments which German exeges are so apt to pronounce on one another. Moreover, the homilies and homiletical illustrations are not a mosaic of quotations from all sources, such as we find both in the 'Homiletical Commentaries' published by Dickinson and the work of Lange already referred to. They are the well-considered work of two highly-competent and thoughtful preachers. Sometimes they entrench upon the exegetical department and suggest sources of further exposition. We call especial attention to the method in which all three writers have handled the 'Magnificat of the Old Testament,' and also the weird and tragic close of Saul's life. The first published instalments of 'The Pulpit Commentary' augur a great success for the work when it shall reach completion."—*Evangelical Magazine.*

"Indeed, the Commentary stands in the same relation to this age that Farrar's 'Life of Christ' does; it is alive with beauty of style and vigour of thought, and conscious of all the light that recent years have cast on the study of the sacred Scriptures. We do not hesitate to say that for exegetical purposes, and for helpful stimulus, it will prove the commentary of the day; and teachers especially, whether in church or school, will find the inspiration that they too often seek in vain in the dull and dreary platitudes of many so-called aids and helps."—*Christian World.*

"The book is a great storehouse of expository and homiletical matter."—*Unitarian Herald.*

"The Dean of Canterbury's monograph on Samuel and his times is very ably done. Its scholarship is what we might have anticipated from the Dean's learning, but its breadth and humanity, its vigorous grasp of the period of Samuel and of his mission in it, and his liberal construction of the questions involved, are as unexpected as they are welcome. The Dean is quite abreast of the criticism of the day, and deals with the questions that it raises in a thorough scholarly and unprejudiced way. Only good can come of such honest and fearless literary criticism as applied to the historical books of the Old Testament—all the more weighty in this instance as coming from a writer whose evangelical orthodoxy and devoutness are beyond all praise.

"Professor Chapman sums up homiletically the characteristics of each section, and Dr. Donald Fraser and Mr. Bryan Dale supply homilies on the principal ideas and verses. Those of Mr. Dale especially are happy and vigorous, and will be very useful to preachers. The work so far worthily justifies its title."—*British Quarterly.*

"Such narratives as the Books of Samuel lend themselves, it is evident, with the greatest ease to the conditions of the homiletic method. Every one knows how comparatively easy it is to preach on a history or a parable which contains in itself the element of personal interest; whereas this has to be supplied by means of illustrative metaphors or stories to teaching given in a more abstract form. Hence we ought to see the method at its best in this volume; and though we cannot tell what future volumes may prove of its advantages, yet assuredly the preachers for whose use this Commentary is intended may be thankful if the same high standard of ability is maintained throughout. We do not know that we have any objection to offer, save on mere matters of opinion here and there. On the whole the Commentary seems to us even better than the 'Notes for Sermons'; but both are generally very good."—*Church Quarterly Review.*

"There is not a verse, and hardly even a clause, or a word involving anything of interest or importance, out of more than 800 verses which this book contains, which is not subjected to the closest criticism."—*Aberdeen Daily Free Press.*

## I. KINGS.

By the Rev. JOSEPH HAMMOND, LL.B.; with Homilies by the Rev. E. DE PRES-SENSE, D.D., Rev. J. WAITE, B.A., Rev. A. ROWLAND, LL.B., Rev. J. A. MACDONALD, and Rev. J. URQUIHART, Price 15s.

[Just Published.

## EZRA, NEHEMIAH, ESTHER.

By Rev. Canon G. RAWLINSON, M.A.; with Homilies by Rev. Prof. J. R. THOMSON, M.A., Rev. Prof. R. A. REDFORD, LL.B., M.A., Rev. W. S. LEWIS, M.A., Rev. J. A. MACDONALD, Rev. A. MACKENNAL, B.A., Rev. W. CLARKSON, B.A., Rev. F. HASTINGS, Rev. W. DINWIDDIE, LL.B., Rev. Prof. ROWLANDS, B.A., Rev. G. WOOD, B.A., Rev. Prof. P. C. BARKER, LL.B., M.A., and Rev. J. S. EXELL. (*Fourth Edition.*) Price 12s. 6d.

### OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

"Wherever we have examined the work, we have found the treatment to be extremely full and satisfactory, and leaving little or nothing to be desired."—*Clergyman's Magazine*.

"There is a certain amount of novelty in the plan of the 'Pulpit Commentary,' and the idea strikes us as a useful one, of rendering assistance to preachers in drawing out the moral and didactic aspects of the Biblical narratives. It is not indeed absolutely new, having been carried out with a prolixity truly German in Lange's 'Bible-work.' But it may fairly be claimed for the present work that a Commentary written in English will prove more adapted practically to English audiences than one which must of necessity, good as it is, bear the marks of its German origin. The plan adopted here is to provide for each chapter or section of a chapter an 'Exposition' giving all necessary explanation of the meaning of the narrative, and illustrating it from history and archaeology. This part of the work seems to us very well done throughout."—*Literary Churchman*.

"So far, however, it seems to have been carried out with care and fair success; and there can be no doubt of its being a vast help to any one wishing to preach sermons on those parts of Scripture."—*Church Quarterly Review*.

"It is a book of solid worth, and to be studied with profit not only by the class for whom it is specially designed, but by students of Scripture generally who desire to make study of the text go hand-in-hand with practical edification. . . . The homiletical parts consist first of homiletical outlines on the paragraphs; then of more special and detailed outlines from different pens, reflecting varieties of thought and treatment. Great pains has evidently been taken to make this portion of the work really useful; and we can honestly recommend the homiletical sections as in the main good, and abounding in strong, healthy common sense, which seldom fails to turn the passage in hand to excellent practical account. We are therefore able to give to this new competitor for public favour a sincere expression of good will."—*Glasgow Herald*.

"The Expositions of the Books of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther, by Professor Rawlinson, are short, compact, clear, and well arranged."—*Scotsman*.

"We shall watch with much interest the course of this Commentary, and we shall be disappointed if it should not prove all that it professes to be, and is fitted to become—a valuable 'pulpit commentary' on the whole of Holy Scripture, useful especially to those who have to prepare sermons for pulpit delivery, but not without its value to others as well as to the clergy."—*John Bull*.

"We are often led to admire the manner in which the various texts are treated, the felicity of arrangement, the suggestive nature of the remarks, and withal the freedom in general from straining the passage, and forcing upon it meanings which it does not naturally bear. There is a soberness, a judiciousness, and a suggestiveness which are much to be commended."—Rev. P. J. GLOAG, D.D.

"We have examined the volume just issued with some care, and feel safe in affirming that it is the most useful book extant on that part of sacred Scripture with which it deals."—*Bradford Daily Telegraph*.

"The conception is admirable, the working out of the idea thorough and conscientious, many of the homilies are striking in their originality, are not unlikely to fire the genius of other and gifted preachers, whilst the printing and general clear arrangement leave nothing to be desired."—*Nonconformist*.

"In all respects this is a very excellent contribution to exegetical literature."—*London Quarterly Review*.

"Preachers must have mistaken their calling altogether if they do not find it easy to think out a sermon after consulting 'The Pulpit Commentary.'"—Rev. C. H. SPURGEON in *Sword and Trowel*.

"Although it bears the name of the *pulpit* commentary, it is not exclusively homiletical. The homily forms a strongly characteristic feature, but exegesis, criticism, and illustration are the basis of the work. Whatever elucidates the text in the way of contemporaneous history, geography, and antiquities; whatever difficulties of a verbal, scientific, or moral kind; whatever conflict there may be, or seem to be, with modern forms of thought and recent speculations in philosophy; all these are first dealt with before the text is applied to homiletical purposes. The undertaking is an ambitious one, but, if we may judge from the volume before us, the high aim will be reached to a considerable extent."—*Sheffield Daily Telegraph*.

"We have here three distinct commentaries, in one handsome volume; and if we can commend the publishers for their part of the work, much more heartily can we recommend the work itself; for anything more fitted to give just the kind of aid which our pulpits need to make them both instructive and edifying we cannot conceive."—*Aberdeen Daily Free Press*.

"The 'Pulpit Commentary' is admirably done. The text is carefully explained, and is made very suggestive. Helpful homilies are appended, fresh, vigorous, and natural. The Book of Esther is a capital specimen of scholarly and helpful exposition."—*Freeman*.

\* \* VOLUMES ON LEVITICUS AND DEUTERONOMY ARE IN THE PRESS,  
AND WILL BE PUBLISHED IMMEDIATELY.

THE  
PULPIT COMMENTARY:  
NEW TESTAMENT.

---

THE favourable manner in which the early volumes of the **PULPIT COMMENTARY ON THE OLD TESTAMENT** have been received, has induced the Editors and Publishers to make active preparation for a similar series devoted to the various books of the **NEW TESTAMENT**. The co-operation of a number of Biblical Scholars, many of whom have been engaged in the revision of the Authorised Version, has already been secured, so that due attention will be given to the changes which have been made in the text, whilst the distinctive character of the **Commentary**, as one that is essentially expository and suggestive, will be borne in mind.

---

BOOKS AND AUTHORS.

ST. MATTHEW.	Rev. J. R. LUMBY, D.D., Norrisian Professor of Divinity, Cambridge University.
„ MARK.	The Very Rev. E. BICKERSTETH, D.D., Dean of Lichfield.
„ LUKE.	Rev. Canon SPENCE, M.A., Vicar of St. Pancras.
„ JOHN.	Rev. Prof. H. R. REYNOLDS, D.D., Cheshunt College.
ACTS.	The Right Rev. Lord A. C. HERVEY, D.D., Bishop of Bath and Wells.
ROMANS.	Rev. JAMES MORRISON, D.D., Glasgow.
I. & II. CORINTHIANS.	Rev. Canon FARRAR, D.D., Westminster.
EPHESIANS.	Rev. Prof. G. W. BLAIKIE, D.D., New College, Edinburgh.
PHILIPPIANS.	The Very Rev. J. J. S. PEROWNE, D.D., Dean of Peterborough.
COLOSSIANS.	Rev. G. G. FINDLAY, B.A., Richmond College.
I., II. THESSALONIANS.	Rev. P. J. GLOAG, D.D.
I., II. TIMOTHY.	The Rev. E. H. PEROWNE, D.D., Vice Chancellor of Cambridge University.
TITUS.	Very Rev. I. S. HOWSON, D.D., Dean of Chester.
PHILEMON.	Rev. S. J. EALES, M.A., Principal of St. Boniface Mission College.
HEBREWS.	Rev. Prof. A. B. BRUCE, D.D., Free Church College, Glasgow.
JAMES.	Rev. Prof. W. F. MOULTON, D.D., The Leys, Cambridge.
I., II. PETER.	Rev. Principal DAVID BROWN, D.D., Free Church College, Aberdeen.
I., II., III. JOHN	Rev. A. PLUMMER, M.A., Master of University College, Durham.

The Writers on the remaining Books will be duly announced, and also the Homiletical Contributors.

---

LONDON: KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH & CO., 1, PATERNOSTER SQUARE, E.C.





1878-1880

